

BEST-SELLING AUTHOR OF "ARIAN Rus",  
"CIVIL HISTORY OF THE MAD WAR"

A, RUROVSKY  
">

FIRST

Cursed  
Emperor

ANDREY BUROVSKY

Pet  
First

Cursed  
Emperor

BBK 63.3(2)46 Reerivoveliiko., Shadows of the B  
city of poverty.. Reni

Design of the series by artist A. Zarubin

Burovsky A. M.

B 92 etr The first is the accursed emperor. — M.: Yauza, Eksmo, 2008.  
— 352 p. — (When history textbooks lie).

15VM 978-5-699-26219-9

We are taught from school that Peter the Great is the greatest figure in our history. They say that before him, Russia was backward and wild, and Peter, not having time to ascend the throne, immediately carried out grandiose reforms, created a mighty Empire and an invincible army, established new morals in society, worked on enlightenment, etc. and so on ... and in general, what would we all do without him!

But as soon as we digress from school textbooks and analyze authentic historical sources, we will find that in pre-Petrine Russia of the 10th / UP century there was already everything that is attributed to Peter: from potatoes and tobacco to an excellent fleet and an army that was quite modern for that time.

In fact, Peter did not create, but destroyed the Russian fleet. The reforms of Peter the Great led to the collapse of the economy, incredible chaos in management and the death of millions of people. And in place of the rich and democratic Muscovy, a poor primitive slave-owner arose.

state.

The myth of Peter the Great and his "European reforms" still lives in books and in souls. It is high time to destroy this dangerous lie that prevents us from knowing and respecting our ancestors.

BBC 63.3(2)46

© Burovsky A.M., 2008 ©  
Yauza Publishing House LLC, 2008 1  
computer 978-5-699-26219-9 © Eksmo Publishing House LLC, 2008

## Introduction

In 1721, Peter [ declared Muscovy the Russian Empire, and until 1917 the imperial period of our history continued. No matter how the political situation changed over these two hundred years, the ideology of the period remained basically unchanged, accompanied by the same unchanged set of political myths.

For about two hundred years in Russia it was supposed to be considered that the Russians were native Europeans, cut off from the rest of Europe by the invasion of the Mongol-Tatars. That the Mongols distorted the Russian national character, the Russians "swallowed the Tatars to their heart's content"! and that in Russia itself the Euros are fighting pai Asia.

Peter the Great made a breakthrough "into Europe", laying the foundation for a new Europeanization of Russia, and our path is towards the complete Europeanization of the country, which will inevitably come ... True, it is completely incomprehensible when. And if it were not for Peter, there would be no breakthrough, and what would happen to us is unknown.

The Grand Duchy of Moscow before Peter ... in general, the whole of "pre-Petrine Rus" was officially described in the blackest colors as the wildest and most primitive society that can be in the world, a hotbed of the most complete obscurantism.

The "appearance" of Peter was supposed to be considered a triumphal procession of reason and enlightenment, cutting through the realm of complete darkness. Even the dirt and blood of his era

1 Tolstoy A.K. Collected works in 4 volumes. T. 1.M., 1963. S. 259.  
5

were interpreted in a romantic light as an inevitability, on which the reflection of some gloomy grandeur falls. Approximately as V.G. Relinsky:

Russia has been covered in darkness for many years.

God of rivers: let there be Peter - and there was light in Russia.

Peter's contemporaries started already. Feofan Prokopovich argued that Peter "made and created all of Russia, which already exists," and having left the world, "left his spirit to us. "Whatever you look at in Russia, everything has its beginning," thought Nartov, and went so far as to call Peter "an earthly god."

Peter Krekshin, one of the first biographers and historians of Peter, seriously continued this line: "Our Father, Peter the Great! You brought us from non-existence into existence."

And after Peter, the glorifying choir did not stop, and from people very often smart, active and deservedly famous.

V.N. Tatishchev claimed that he owed everything in his life, and especially "reason", to Peter.

Cantermire wrote "Petridus", dedicated his poems and "verses" to Peter.

"He is your God, your God was, Russia!" exclaimed Lo MonoSov.

It is very characteristic that the young Alexander Pushkin, until the Boldin autumn, willingly wrote poems about Peter and the Petrine era, broke out with his magnificent "Poltava", but as soon as he seriously took up the Petrine era, the "horror" of the twentieth century, "The Bronze Horseman", was born. However, even without the Bronze Horseman, it was rumored in St. Petersburg that in high water, in strong autumn storms or in a winter blizzard, the monument to Peter falls off the pedestal, gallops around the city, and supposedly they even saw the corpses of those crushed by a monstrous horseman. Is it true? Artifice? But, in any case, there was a legend, and some remnants of its life

6

here in the city and still; Pushkin wrote based on the legend.

The intelligentsia, learned people considered and still consider Peter a symbol of progress and movement forward, towards the shining heights of enlightenment. And popular rumor endowed the monument to Peter with all the features of a demon! This was said in passing to the question of whether Bogli said "let there be Peter" ... This is very polemical.

Leo Tolstoy, in his youth, also greatly revered Peter, almost revered him, and was going to write a novel about him... And also only until he began to collect materials for the novel. It was then that Leo Tolstoy began to speak differently about a very recent idol: "There was a wasp of a dumb beast ..."  
A great bastard, a pious once slayer, a murderer who blasphemed the Gospels.

I eat ... Forget about it, and do not erect monuments.

It remains to be assumed that the same thing happened to both Pushkin and Tolstoy - from childhood they were in the field of deification, adoration, exaltation, extreme romanticization of Peter and the entire Petrine era. They received it enthusiastically, not because they themselves thought of it before, and not because they had much knowledge about the era. And precisely because it seems that they did not have much knowledge. The romantically elevated, joyful attitude towards Peter changes as the era is recognized, as the documents are studied.

This begs the question: I wonder what Lomonosov would have said if he had lived longer and had time to start compiling not only early Russian history, before 1054, but if he had reached the era of Peter the Great? If Mikhailo Vasilyevich would begin to collect documents of the time of Peter the Great, systematically write about this time? Maybe it would be the same as with Pushkin?

Another thing is that 90 percent of people build their attitude towards historical figures not on the basis of independent study, but on the basis of some established opinion or listening to propaganda. And here for a hundred years, two hundred years, almost no voices were heard, except for enthusiastic ones.

And of course, it is quite understandable that all extremists of all stripes, all radicals and "revolutionary democrats" adored Peter. And all the same Belinsky:

"For me, Peter is my philosophy, my religion, my revelation in everything that concerns Russia. This is an example for great and small who want to do something, to be something useful."

Herzen chokes no less: "Peter, the Convention taught us to walk by leaps and bounds, to walk from the first month of pregnancy to the ninth."

Here, not only enthusiasm itself is characteristic, but also the identification of the Emperor with the revolutionary French Convention. The example of Peter turns out to be no less important for the "democratic revolutionary" "awakened by the Decembrists" than the example of the French revolutionaries—how interesting! Already this example is enough to suggest that, apparently, other lovers learned to jump "from the first month of pregnancy to the ninth" on the example of Peter.

At least, Marx, and Engels, and Trotsky, and Vovka Ulyanov - they were all the greatest supporters of Peter, his enthusiastic admirers.

For centuries, for decades, Peter the Great, Peter, was spoken of exclusively in the most solemn words: great reformer! Great person! Great



enlightener! Father of the people! Empire Maker!

"The great man matured already in his youth and grabbed the helm of the state with a powerful hand," N.M. Karamzin.

Karamzin N.M. A note about ancient and new Russia. M., 1991. S. 31.

"... a horned man physically and spiritually", "an unseen god tyr, who was heavy from strength, as from a heavy burden ... he was cramped in the old Kremlin palace, there was nowhere to straighten the shoulders of a heroic one ..." - this is how he writes about him CM. Solovyov'.

And further, in the same epic style: "The young god tyr rushed out of the house from his mother - to stretch the shoulders of the god of tyr, to try the strength and prowess of the brave"; "... the hero-transformer, the founder of a new kingdom, or rather, a new empire ..."

In this choir of doxology, the voices of the greatest historians of Russia - V.N. Tatishcheva, N.M. Karamzin, N.M. Solovieva, V.O. Klyuchevsky, E.V. Tarle, V.V. Mav homeland. In the same choir - the voices of A.S. Pushkin and M.Yu. Lermontov, A.N. Tolstoy and K.N. Simonova, V.N. Ge and V.V. Surikov. Peter is glorified by every possible literary and artistic means.

It is difficult to doubt the truths that bear and proclaim SUCH names, the leading figures of Russian culture of the past and present.

Even the liberal St. Petersburg historian E.V. Anisimov calls Peter the "great reformer", scrupulously listing what he left behind:

"The last recruitment took place in 1874, that is, 170 years after the first (1705). The Senate existed from 1711 to December 1917, that is, 206 years; The synodal structure of the Church remained unchanged from 1721 to 1918, i.e., for 197 years; the system of tribute tax was abolished only in 1887, i.e., 163 years after its introduction in 1724.

1 Soloviev S.M. History of Russia since ancient times. UP book. M., 1962. S. 183.

2 Anisimov E.V. Peter the Great: the birth of an empire // History of the Fatherland. People, ideas, solutions. M., 1991. S. 186.

9

True, already in the 17th century a completely different voice sounded - Prince Shcherbatov, with his magnificent, poisonous and

smart book - "On the damage to morals in Russia." Prince Shcherbatov quite seriously believed that the customs of pre-Petrine Rus' were healthier, "more correct" than those that arose later, and that it would be better for the morality of the people to do without reforms altogether. But, firstly, few people read this book in the USSR, and even in the twentieth century - it was published only in 1888. Prince Shcherbatov wrote, if not for himself personally, then for some super-narrow circle; for those who can understand his arguments and who are not dangerous to allow to criticize the path chosen by Russia, that is, for aristocrats - and aristocrats, and in terms of their financial situation, and in terms of education, and moral qualities. |

Secondly, Prince Shcherbatov did not doubt the benefits of the Petrine reforms. Yes, they are terrible in their methods. Yes, they led to terrible consequences. But these are absolutely necessary reforms. From the point of view of Prince Shcherbatov, had it not been for Peter's "spurt", it would have taken Russia 2,775 years to reach the same level of development that it had achieved in 50 years, by 1775. If not for the reforms of Peter, Russia would have continued to lag behind and would have been devoured and torn apart by the European powers.

We will not dispute specific figures, they are not the point. It is much more important that, in general terms, Prince Shcherbatov defined the criticism of Peter and the time of Peter the Great for decades and centuries to come.

Alexei Tolstoy's "Peter's Day" was written from exactly the same positions, with its downright sinister coloring; after all, even there the Old Believer Varlaam, brought out by the worst enemy and "opponent" of Peter, is a wild fanatic, unable to offer anything but a return to the back.

10

Such are the escapades of Boris Pilnyak: no alternative to what Peter did is depicted, he simply depicts a disgusting, always drunk syphilitic and freak.

The trouble is not even that these voices of criticism were heard for a short time - from those times when the reforms of Alexander II made the political climate of the Russian Empire not so stuffy, threw out a lot of documents that practically no one knew before or knew in a very insufficient volume. And any critical statements ended by the "year of the great turning point", 1929, when the Central Committee explained to everyone and once and for all by a number of decisions that Ivan the Terrible, Peter I and some other characters of Russian history are beyond criticism. The communists killed Pilnyak rather quickly, in 1937, and Alexei Tolstoy became Stalin's court writer and created a completely false, disgusting lackey-

sky novel "Peter I", in which, of course, he did not repeat the previous "erroneous assessments".

For almost all three hundred years of the imperial period, criticism of Peter remained, firstly, extremely cautious and allowed only in the circle of people whose loyalty the Empire could not doubt. In the mouths of any other people, such criticism immediately turned, at best, into blasphemy, or even simply into subversion and undermining the power of the Russian state.

Secondly, this criticism has always remained purely moralistic. No one offered alternatives, no one tried to understand what would have happened in Russia and throughout Eastern and Northern Europe if Peter had forgotten his famous reforms while drinking and the "All-Joking Council", or if Peter had been strangled in early childhood and not no such reign of Peter would have arisen in the history of the Russian state.

1 Pilnyak B. His Majesty Knes Rieg Kogapdog. Pg., 1922.

eleven

For all historians, writers, poets, and statesmen, it is "obviously" that Peter's reforms are absolutely necessary, and precisely in the form or nearly the form in which they took place. Well, yes, there were some "ugly cases", some "excesses", cases of cruelty and rudeness... and in general the country paid an exorbitantly high price for the reforms. The farther from the era of Peter, the more readily historians and cultural figures moralize on these topics, but what they only moralize is they talk about the price of reforms and that, in general, if Peter were not so cool, not so ferocious, but handy if it is better shaped and more decent, then there would be fewer unnecessary, superfluous cruel bones.

Over the centuries, a scheme has developed for understanding our history of the St. Petersburg imperial period. It is not difficult to present this scheme, and it can be done literally in a few paragraphs.

1. Peter introduced in Russia something that was completely absent before him: from paintings on secular themes and mirrors in houses to a modern army and a system of government.
2. Peter was originally a supporter of reforms, their banner; he seized power in the struggle against the fierce enemies of the reforms.
3. All the cruelties committed by Peter, all the "excesses" of his era are explained by the terrible impressions of childhood, when in front of his eyes the archers, enemies of the reforms, killed his beloved uncle. The second explanation is that he was protecting not only himself, he was protecting his offspring from the neve-

virile and vicious people. He executed them - so they should!

4. Peter was a genius on the throne; a great man, able to see for centuries to come. All his supporters, not to mention the enemies, did not see and could not comprehend all the greatness done by the giant of the spirit.

12

5. Peter's reforms are the greatest blessing for Russia; it is terrible to think what would have happened to us all if it were not for Peter the Great!

All the "myths of Peter" and the "myths of the Petrine era" fit into these simple five points.

Here a situation arises that is very similar to the one we already encountered in the book Russian Atlantis: when some opinion about Russian history is literally hammered into the heads in a variety of ways and finally begins to be perceived without any criticism.

And in schools, and even in universities, and in the media, and in fiction, there is one opinion, one idea, one position.

By the way, critics of Peter and his time also accept this idea, and with the same measure of uncriticality. Because when they talk about Peter's cruelty or the disastrous consequences of his unfortunate "reforms", they still have little doubt. In the very need to break the age-old way of Russian life, to exterminate the "opponents of reforms", to rob churches, to ruin and drive millions of people to complete despair, to flight from Russia - few people seriously think about all these "necessities". The most basic question is not asked: was it even necessary to do what Peter did? And even if it was necessary, then in what forms?

This question is not asked for an understandable reason: because, having only asked this question, we immediately depart from the traditions of the St. Petersburg period of Russian history, when such questions were considered either blasphemous or obviously meaningless.

If we look closely at the life of the "condo" pre-Petrine Rus', we will immediately discover the most amazing things! Not only will we find notorious paintings, mirrors, painters and theater in Muscovite Rus' of the 17th century, but it will very quickly "turn out" that management reforms,

13

and the regular army has been created for forty years, not even

before the accession - before the birth of Peter.

And moreover... We will discover, for example, that a huge number of Russian people of the "simplest" condition, primarily peasants, live outside the community, choose their own priests, value book teaching (that same enlightenment?), qualifications, private initiative and have a very positive attitude towards smart people who, through their own teaching and work, were able to make themselves rich. Yes, they wear blouses, bast shoes and hats, and their daughters and wives wear sarafans over linen shirts... But how do they differ in essence, not in form, from other Europeans?! After all, the Norwegians look and behave quite differently from the Italians and the French, and the Poles do not understand the English in everything, and they dress differently.

In the same way, we "suddenly" discover commercial capital in Rus', which, for the life of me, does not fundamentally differ in any way from Dutch and Swedish... The attitude of the state towards it differs - in Rus' state capital does not support, does not protect and it doesn't help him, but that's a completely different matter.

Yes, even with the nobles, on closer examination, no less amazing things "happen". Faithful servants of the state Darevs "suddenly turn out to be" devoted to ideas that are very European in spirit, very modern for the 15th century. They "suddenly" turn out to be supporters of parliamentarism, and, moreover, long before they are "supposed" to be imbued with these ideas. According to the scheme shared by all sides of the NIKI of the "Europeanization of the nobility" - from Prince Shcherbatsky to Lenin - Radishchev should be called the first consistent supporter of "progressive ideas", and the Decembrists became the first generation of revolutionaries, because this is the "third unworn generation of nobles" and therefore that during the campaigns of 1813-1815 they visited

14

in Europe and became infected with its spirit. And here the nobles, almost a hundred years before the Decembrists, in 1730, manifest themselves as completely European estates; people whose psychology differs very little from that of the German or Scandinavian nobility.

The Decembrists were a minority who did not at all approve of the majority of their class. In 1730, not a disappearing minority, but even the majority of the Russian nobles wanted to limit the power of the tsar and introduce a constitution in Russia. If we accept the logic of the stamps of the St. Petersburg period of Russian history, then in 1730 the Russian nobles, it turns out, were "more progressive" and more like Europeans than in 1825 ...

In 1730, not individual nobles, but the nobility, with the vote of the majority of their representatives, demanded a constituency.

tucia. But the fact remains that then, in the frosty air of the winter of 1730, for the first time there was a smell of the appearance of the Russian constitution ... There was a breath of the spirit of limiting the always absolute power of the monarch. And by limiting always the absolute rights of the draft state. The youth of 1730 was brought up in an atmosphere of service to Peter, and even the dirt and shame of palace coups. Old people remember pre-Petrine Rus' well. It would seem - well, how can they own such "progressive" ideas?! And it turns out they do.

And there are many such cases. So much so that a critical thinker cannot help but doubt the scheme itself—even one that is considered very indecent to doubt.

Here is the topic of historical investigation: what was it, pre-Petrine Rus'? To what extent blunt and kondovoy? And no less important topic: what exactly did Peter do if everything or almost everything attributed to him does not correspond to reality? And: what could Russia be without Peter? In the end, one person

15

it is only one of a great multitude, and the life of this one subject to many accidents, as they say in the East, "his life is like a tear on an eyelash." In the end, his father, Alexei Mikhailovich, had several sons in two marriages, and only one survived. And if he survived - not Peter? What if NO ONE SURVIVED?

What if Peter had not been born, would have died "from the stomach" in infancy, or would have been strangled by angry archers in 1682? What would then become of Russia and the dreams of all?

With these questions in mind, I sat down to write this book.

Candidate of Historical Sciences, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, full member of the Academy of the Noosphere, member of the St. Petersburg Union of Scientists, and so on and so forth ...

Part |

PRINCE OF  
THE SECOND FRESHNESS

- Motor and speech excitement ... delusional

interpretations .... the case, apparently, is complex ...

schizophrenic, presumably. And then there's alcoholism... M.A. Bulgakov

Chapter 1

## BEAR COUP

The first wife is from God, the second is from a man, the third is from the devil  
ox.

Dubious folk wisdom, which, however, is often  
confirmed

## BEFORE PETER

Until January 1676, the legitimate monarch, the second tsar from the  
Romanov dynasty, Alexei Mikhailovich, sat on the throne of Muscovy. He  
died "in 1676, from the 29th to the 30th of January, from Saturday to Sunday, at  
4 o'clock in the morning ... in the 47th year of his birth, having blessed his eldest  
son Fyodor to the kingdom".

People die at an earlier age, but as if nothing foreshadowed his death.  
The tsar was healthy, active, vigorous, nothing seriously ill. The court physicians  
were surprised by his death. A wave of rumors about the poisoning spread  
across Russia.

The marriage of the tsar with Maria Ilinichnaya Miloslavskaya lasted  
from 1648 to 1669. From Miloslavskaya, Alexei Mikhailovich had five sons and  
six daughters: Evdokia, Marfa, Sofya, Ekaterina and Maria. But the boys  
somehow did not live in this family. The eldest sons Dimitri and Alexei  
died during the life of their parents. In March 1669

'  
Soloviev S.M. History of Russia since ancient times. W. M. book.,  
1961.S. 608.

19

Yes, Marya Ilyinichna died, Tsarevich Simeon followed her.

By January 22, 1672, the day on which Alexei Mikhailovich married Natalya  
Naryshkina, the daughter of a captain from Smolensk, two of his sons were  
alive: Fedor, born in 1661, and Ivan, born in 1666. No matter how honorable it  
was for a girl from the Naryshkin family to marry an elderly king, the children  
from this marriage were not destined to reign.

From his second wife, Alexei Mikhailovich had daughters Natalya and Theodora, and the future Tsar Peter Alekseevich was born in 1672, from the elderly, 43-year-old then, Alexei Mikhailovich, and Natalya Kirillovna Naryshkina - she was already twenty-one years old (a lot according to the concepts FUCK century).

On January 26, 1676, Fyodor Alekseevich Romanov, the eldest son of the former Tsar, aged 15, became Tsar of the Moscow State. It was not the first time that a young king ascended the throne. Michael was married at the age of 17, Alexei was married at the age of 13. But for the first time the king ascended the throne to such an extent intellectual.

Wanting to see Fedor after him, the royal father took care of his education, and one of the leading Russian scientists of that time, Simeon Polotsky, became his teacher. The tsar's teacher Simeon of Polotsk and his student Sylvester Medvedev were preparing for the opening of the first Russian university.

Fedor was fluent in Polish, Latin, and Ancient Greek, and read ancient authors in the original. He was well versed in religious literature, the works of the Church Fathers, was fond of music, especially singing, and composed several spiritual hymns himself. Even against the background of his father and grandfather, people who were not very stupid and educated, he gave the impression of a pronounced intellectual. One of his favorite occupations was that he "gathered artists of every skill and needlework", paid them a decent salary, watched their work and had long conversations with them.

Fedor Alekseevich took care of the heir: on July 11, 1681, he and his wife, Agafya Semyonovna Grushets

20

Coy, son Ilya was born. But on July 14, Queen Agafya died in childbirth, and after 6 days Ilya himself died.

On February 14, 1682, exactly 7 months after the death of Agafya, Tsar Fedor married Martha Matveev not Apraksina.

There were no children from this marriage: on April 27, 1682, Tsar Fedor died at the age of 21. It is believed that he was sickly and frail, the causes of death were considered natural, despite the youth of the king.

And there was a strange, ambiguous situation. About proclaiming the eldest daughter of Alexei Mikhailovich Sofya, born in 1658, as queen? No one doubted her abilities, but women never sat on the throne of Muscovy ... That is, in other countries - there were, in



including several basilisses in the Byzantine Empire. But in Russia there have not yet been ruling queens, and it is completely incomprehensible how the notorious masses of the people will react to such an innovation ...

Monarchy is not the worst political system in the world. But the monarchy is very vulnerable. Only two early deaths - father and son - in April 1682 brought Muscovy to the brink of civil strife, civil war, and in general it's scary to say what - almost a new turmoil. The clans of the Miloslavskys and Naryshkins clashed in a merciless war, Prince Khovansky raised an uprising with the archery army. "Khovanshchina" flooded Moscow.

Sofya Alekseevna played the main role in suppressing the Khovanshchina and restoring order. The order established in 1682 turned out to be fragile and strange, two tsars were immediately enthroned: Ivan (from Miloslavskaya, born in 1666) and Peter from Naryshkina, born in 1672. Above both kings stood the "ruler Sophia." Not a king and not a queen, but a "ruler" with an indefinite tenure in this position, with unprescribed boundaries of power.

Beloved Sofya Alekseevna, Vasily Vasilyevich Golitsyn, in the years 1682-1689 formally stood at the head of various government agencies, but in fact

21

Chesky was about what the prime minister is today.

Sophia and the "first tsar" Ivan lived in the Moscow Kremlin. Peter and the top of the Naryshkin clan - in Preobrazhensky.

Until 1682, Peter did not have a single chance to become king. Now he has appeared, this chance. Moreover, his mother, Natalya Kirillovna, was extremely ambitious, active and used absolutely any means to achieve her goal. She was given the appropriate nickname - Med Vediha. There was a persistent rumor that it was she who poisoned first Alexei Mikhailovich, and then Fyodor Alekseevich. The rumor has never been proven, but they both died very "in time", clearing the way for the throne for Peter.

Calling a spade a spade, Peter | became king by accident, after the early deaths of several of his relatives and as a result of these deaths.

THE END OF MULTIPLE POWER

Sooner or later, the half-hearted situation in the country was supposed to explode, and this happened in August

1689. Supporters of Sophia accused Medvedikha of sending assassins to Sofya: three scoundrels with knives were caught, wandering around the Kremlin. Under torture, these three testified that Natalya Kirillovna had sent them with the task of killing Sophia and Vasily Golitsyn. Naryshki, of course, denied their involvement. Even if there was involvement, it is very difficult to prove it.

This is a strange story - suddenly in the middle of the Kremlin there are three vagabonds with knives in their bootlegs ... During the Streltsy rebellion, the Khovanshchina of 1682, there was no one in the Kremlin, but now there is no rebellion and rebellion. The Kremlin is the seat of the government, the "first tsar" and the "ruler", armed archers stand at the gates and they won't let anyone through. Where are the three vagrants from? Maybe the agents of the Naryshkins did their best - either bribed people, or their secret supporters? Very possible. But another thing is no less possible - that the murderers themselves are false from beginning to end, and third-party

22

Sophia's ki "found" them in the middle of the Kremlin precisely because they themselves led them there.

The very fact that there were such people wandering around the Kremlin proves little. Well, maybe these little people were preparing homicide. Maybe they wanted to slaughter Sofya too - then it was possible to sell her head very dearly to Naryshkin ... But it is very possible that Natalya Kirillovna really had nothing to do with these people. After all, absolutely nothing has been proven, their connection has not been traced in any way, and those caught themselves soon disappear.

It may be, of course, that they disappeared not at all for contemporaries, but for you and me - just one part of the documents is known, while others disappeared, did not reach us and are unknown to us. In the study of history, such things happen at every turn, what to do.

But if the caught "walking people" really disappeared without a trace, this is very, very suspicious. In this case, it seems that Sophia's supporters tried to "blind the case", and when it didn't work out, an unambiguous, obvious thread for everyone to the Naryshkins didn't reach, they hurried to hide the ends in the water. Not necessarily everything had to end badly for the vagabonds; I absolutely cannot rule out the possibility that somewhere in Belgorod or Kursk a strange man soon showed up with a belt full of gold. And, if he didn't talk too much, he gradually went out to be a merchant ...

Did they confess themselves? It is also not conclusive, because you never know what fantastic things people show under torture! For example, the unfortunate "witches" of the German inquisitors gave such testimonies that one can only wonder: they flew to the Sabbath, and consorted with the devil.

they danced, and they organized crop failure, a hurricane, floods.

In a word, an extremely dark story.

And a few days later another one happens, no less dark: a certain man comes running to Preobrazhenskoye, shouting that, they say, there, in the bushes, armed people are sitting, they want to harass the tsar. According to other sources, not an "unknown person" came running, but an archer from the guard - they say, the rest of the guards are fighting with the intruders, give help, save the king!

23

This story is even darker than the first, because no one has ever seen these intruders. Did they sit, they say, in the bushes, waiting for the king ... Why the king? Who said that they were waiting for someone at all? And were they at all, these mysterious people who sat in the bushes in the evening?

The story of the murderers sent from Sophia is important because it became a trigger for important historical events. The fact is that Peter, who had just returned from the German settlement, Kukuya, and fell asleep, was mortally frightened of these mysterious murderers. In one shirt, with a twisted face, Peter rushed to run, to save himself wherever his eyes looked. Emitting wild cries, convulsively twitching his face and whole body, he barely got on the horse, and the poor animal rushed under the maddened rider. Peter rode to the Trinity-Sergius Lavra, under the protection of mighty walls, surrendered to the will of the monks - here, holy fathers, save me, they are killing me! Apparently, they really were incredibly scared. However, even then, many times in a situation of the slightest danger, this reaction will be repeated - hysteria, an epileptic seizure, stifled screams, a stampede wherever one's eyes look.

Already in the morning, Peter's orderly, Alexander Menshikov, arrives at Trinity, brings his "dear friend" trousers and some kind of clothes: Peter, after all, literally galloped away in a body shirt, barely covering himself. Peter refuses to get out from under the protection of the colossal walls of the monastery-fortress, and his entire court from the village of Preobrazhenskoye moves here. Throughout the country there is a call to all the nobility, to all state officials, to the army - to gather here, to the Trinity-Sergius Lavra! They call on the Ryshkins to gather the noble militia, to move with all their might against the traitors who tried to kill the "second king". Civil war situation...

Of course, Sophia, on her own behalf and on behalf of the "first tsar", also convenes a noble militia: everyone go to Moscow, to the Kremlin - her formidable order sounds!

That Peter's nerves could not stand it - obviously, someone is arguing, but it looks very similar - not only with him, but with both sides.

Ron simply could not stand the nerves. The point is that no

24

long before that, Peter was married to Evdokia Lopukhina. According to the then Russian customs, a married guy became an adult. Having married, the heir to the throne received the right to sit on the throne. The "first tsar" Ivan is weak-minded, which means that the "second tsar" reigns.

So the nerves of both Sophia and Peter's supporters could not stand it.

At the end of August 1689, the country finds itself in a situation that is still cold, without firing, but a completely real war - civil and dynastic. There are two governments in the country: one in Moscow, the other in the Trinity-Sergius Lavra, and each demands loyalty from every person in any way noticeable in the country. He demands to appear "equestrian, crowded and armed", express his loyalty and speak out in favor of this particular government. |

The country chooses the Naryshkins. From all over the vast country, a stream slowly but steadily flows into the Troy Tse-Sergius Lavra. From Moscow, from Sophia's camp, exactly the same stream flows, right down to the last, it would seem, a hundred rows of proven people. Of course, many people choose Lavra not because they are convinced of something, they believe something, or they rely on someone. 90% of the nobles, not to mention ordinary soldiers and archers, are guided not by considerations about the fate of Russia, but by their own selfish aspirations, fears and calculations. And very often - and direct orders of benefactors, bosses or overlords.

But there is undoubtedly a choice, at least the choice of those who are authorized to order these 90% or to convince them of something. Counting on mercy if the Naryshkins win? But even the Miloslavskys are not stingy for those; who will put Sophia on the throne. Direct bribery? But the Naryshkins have no incredible wealth, no opportunity to distribute court ranks, or, rather, no more of them than political competitors. They are no richer than the Miloslavskys and their supporters, and the pretender to the throne on their part is still more "unsightly" - the "second tsar", and not at all the first and not the ruler ...

Why does the country still choose the Naryshkins?

25

One reason is simple - it's Sophia's gender. Imagine that in her place there would be not the daughter of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich, but a son. Let's say ... well, the same Vasily. Let yes-

not endowed with all the talents and virtues of Vasily Golitsyn, but also not a fool, not a nonentity, not a coward ... Let's say, something average, a kind of person of average talents and abilities (like the founder of the dynasty, Mikhail, for example). Or even more so a person with the same extraordinary abilities as Sophia herself, but only a man?

It is strange that this idea has not yet occurred to our historians, it is, after all, elementary. But everyone I asked, how, in their opinion, - what if not Sofya Alekseevna, but a son sat on the throne on the side of the Miloslavskys ... let's call him at least Vasily Alekseevich, and even of the same years ( in 1689 Sophia was 31 years old)? Ivan Alekseevich, sickly and stupid, "sorrowful in the head," is, of course, not a banner. Well, what if the Miloslavskys still had a banner? And everyone with whom I discussed this possibility is unanimous - in this case, Peter would not have had a single chance. None!

So it turns out that the country was ready to recognize the woman as the "ruler", as they get used to the situation - and the ruling queen. But exactly what not to choose, but to recognize, since such a situation has developed. Russia was ready to put up with the state of affairs, since there was no better candidate; to agree that a woman sits on the throne, according to the good old principle "there is no fish and cancer is a fish .. But to choose a woman as king, take responsibility for the fact that she will sit on the throne, give her power - Russia was completely unprepared for this.

But this is only one and, very likely, far from the main reason. I admit that this will sound unbelievable, even wild - but it seems that Peter got power precisely because he personally and the Naryshkins personified the worst political stagnation.

Everyone knows that Sofya and Golitsyn are reforms, this is a movement. And Pyotr is Medvedikha standing behind him with her

26

a clan of people who are not ideological, mentally not large, not at all eager to do something. In Peter himself, absolutely nothing made it possible to see the future reformer.

Yes, by this time Peter already had two or three thousand "amusing troops." But after all, the regiments of the "foreign system", foreign officers, commands in Dutch and German, the completely "foreign" type of army formations by that time were not at all something unusual in Russia, something that aroused surprise and interest. In the Preobrazhensky and Semyonovsky regiments, there was nothing at all that set them off favorably, forcing them to stand out from all the other "regiments of the foreign system", and yet

the entire Russian army since 1680 consisted of regular regiments with European training. |

Some European things that Peter loved? Teachings from Europeans?

Firstly, who in Russia knew what and from whom Peter was learning? And who was interested?

Secondly, Peter did not have any such "European teaching". That is, they showed him the globe, and all kinds of instruments, and maps. But they showed no more than they should have shown any Russian prince, and besides, they were not from among the "main heirs". Fyodor, "the first heir to the throne", was taught incomparably more seriously and much more "Europeanly".

Tube in your mouth? Drinking in Kukuy Sloboda? Friendship with Franz Lefort and other foreigners? But this does not in any way speak of a program of reforms, but only indicates a readiness to adopt the worst aspects of European life. In the most pleasant case, all this speaks of a restless youth, striving to try everything in the world, to participate in every nasty thing at least a little and, if only out of curiosity. At its worst, Peter's rampages testify to his depraved and rough nature. But by no means do all these actions testify to the desire to change something in the country in essence.

In addition, 17-year-old Peter never expressed his commitment to reforms, did not speak of a desire to destroy the old days. Later he will be credited with hatred for the boyars, for the "Byzantine", for the old Muscovites

27

ancient times... But all this is pure fiction, because Peter himself never said anything of the sort. In essence, he never talked about anything serious, was not interested in anything definite, did not build any projects. Vasily Golitsyn could frighten (or attract) someone with his large-scale programs, but Peter doesn't have them at all.

To a certain extent, this is even good for seizing power ... On the one hand, Peter does not attract active people, reformers, businessmen, and on the other hand, he just does not scare away passive people who are not inclined to rush somewhere (and they always majority). And judging by the choice that Russia is making, the majority of its ruling stratum is just more important "not to scare away" the prospect of reforms.

We have to conclude that there are few supporters of Europeanization in Russia in 1689. Moreover, a "calm" variant of changes, without "raising on its hind legs", is possible mainly when people who came to power legally stand at the helm of the state, but

and without direct elections: for example, the same legitimate heirs to the throne. And they have to be reckoned with, and at the same time, as if they are in power against the will of each individual person ... If they, these legitimate monarchs, demand participation in reforms, a change in the way of life - well, you will have to obey! But do not choose for yourself, out of good will, what to do in any case, you will be under pressure, grimacing and cursing everything in the world ...

As soon as Russia was able to choose, it chose a camp less connected with the country's transformations.

In the Lavra, when the boyars and nobles had already begun to gather in it, the mother and the patriarch specifically persuaded Peter to behave as they expected of him: walk with quiet steps, speak modestly and meekly, spend more time in church, ask the opinions of elders about everything ..

And on the third hand... Who said that when coming to the Trinity-Sergius Lavra, the Russians chose Peter?! Peter was neither seen nor heard. Well, he ran around Preobrazhensky and Semyonovsky, played war games, played sly in Kukui ... so what? Who knew Peter? Who spoke to him, who considered him a serious factor in politics?

28

And no one. They did not know him, but his mother, Natalya Kirillovna, Medvedikha. They knew her brother, Lev Kirillovich, their distant relative Nikita Streshnev. They knew the patriarch, they knew Fyodor Yuryevich Romodanovsky, who treated Peter well. These people were important in politics, and it was they who came to power. They negotiated, promised places, formed alliances, persuaded and intimidated.

This coalition, the Naryshkin clan, received power in ultimately.

Until her death on January 25, 1694, Natalya Kirillovna Naryshkina not only did not transfer all power to Peter ... She did not even let him come close to making any important decisions. Moreover, there are serious grounds for believing that it was she who developed the most evil inclinations in Peter - to drunkenness, to debauchery, to various kinds of follies - if only he was engaged in amusing, war, mistresses, friends, drinking companions, fleet, wife. .. anything. However, she also skillfully and purposefully quarreled with his wife, and also with a clear goal - so that her son would not have a rear in his own family, could not start a serious war with her ... However, where could he be!

So it was not Peter personally who came to power, but the position of Natalya Kirillovna was well known in Russia - no changes! The position is strange for the pupil of the prominent "Westernizer" Matveev, for the daughter of a captain in

"Shelf of a foreign system", but what can you do?! Yes, this is the position. Under her ... let's say, in the first years of Peter's reign, until the death of his mother, no changes in the government of the country took place. Of course, the plans for the transformation of Vasily Golitsyn were not implemented in any way. Even the little that Fedor and Sophia managed to do was destroyed.

Fedor and Sofya with Golitsyn attached great importance to the fairness of justice, the cessation of bribery and bribery of officials. They tried to pay officials more so that they would be insensitive to offers of even small bribes and would gain self-esteem.

29

Now, according to Prince Boris Kurakin, "very dishonest government", "great bribery and theft of the state", "judicial untruths" and other outrages have been established.

Everything depended on the Naryshkin clan, which was run by several people. The first, of course, was Natalya Kirillovna, according to the same Kurakin, "the rule was incapable (from the French "pe saraye" - "not capable"), a small mind." The smartest of her "confidants," Prince Boris Golitsyn, was a smart and well-educated man, but he "drank incessantly" and, in charge of the Kazan Palace, completely ruined the Volga region.

Lev Kirillovich Naryshkin, the tsarina's brother, turned out to be a good-natured, not vile person, and did not even settle scores with the Miloslavskys for previous humiliations. The man is "an eccentric, narrow-minded and drunk", he did a lot of good to the most random people, "without reason, according to his humor." He did not glorify himself with any state affairs, he was not particularly needed by anyone, and they gave him the nickname Kot Kirillovich. A relative of both tsars by their grandmother, Tikhon Streshnev is also assessed by Kurakin as "a narrow-minded person", but crafty and evil, and "a great undesirer of good for anyone."

The Lopukhins clan never put forward bright leaders or representatives, and remained a blind spot in history with the inscription: "Lopukhins". There were up to thirty of them, "evil people, stingy people of the lowest minds."

So the Naryshkins, "gentlemen of the lowest and most miserable gentry", the most miserable clique ... or, to be more proper, this gang came to power. She pushed even the Boyar Duma from making any decisions, and the first aristocrats of Muscovy "were left without any provoir and were only performances in the council or in the chamber."

The service and command society was quite a match for the clique that came to power. This audience and "clean"



I didn't have to, it was enough to remove external pressure, the fear of disgrace, demotion, punishment.

One can judge this society at least from the notes of the okolnichsky Zhelyabuzhsky, an observer and even a participant in many affairs in those years. These notes are long

thirty

A variety of people pass in a row, from boyars and roundabouts to ordinary clerks, tried for the most diverse ... rather, perhaps, for rather monotonous crimes: homicide, insulting a girl's honor, forgery of documents, "frantic words" about the Sovereign, "obscene language" in the palace, for stealing gold coins with the help of Tikhon Streshnev.

The most striking crime was committed, perhaps, by Prince Lobanov-Rostovsky, who on the Trinity Road once fought off the royal treasury. Why did he, the owner of several hundred peasant households, need this, history is silent. For robbery, the prince was beaten with a whip, and yet six years later, in the Kozhukhovsky campaign, he was already mentioned as the captain of Preobrazhensky

shelf.

According to the fair remark of V.O. Klyuchevsky, "in this court society, it is in vain to look for divisions into the old and the new, conservative and progressive parties: wild instincts and mores fought, not ideas and trends.

NIA!.

A natural question arises: why did everything that Fyodor, then Sofya and Golitsyn did, collapse like that?! Moreover, it collapsed so easily and so instantly?!

What to do! Muscovy remained a very young, primitive state, where everything is very fragile, unstable already because of the lack of well-established traditions of state life. Where everything is easy to destroy, because the whole statehood rests on the devotion of literally a few people and on the labor efforts of literally a few people.

Incredibly narrow is the circle of all those who can make at least some decisions in Muscovy in general. A few tens, from the strength of hundreds of people determine the life of tens of thousands. Everyone personally knows everyone, all the relations of the patriarch are simple and simple. Under this pyramid and outside it are millions

'  
Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 2. Ros  
Tov-on-Don, 2000. S. 476.

31

people live outside of the state. That is, they help him, participate in his affairs, but not regularly, and for them, perhaps, the life of their family and community is more important than the life of the Muscovite state.

If the “upper” few people who headed the power pyramid are eliminated, their efforts to rebuild, change or improve something may well go to waste. Because the rest of the tens of thousands of servicemen will honestly carry out the order - but they themselves do not at all carry in themselves those ideas that the top few hundreds are hatching.

Are the king and his entourage forced not to take bribes, not to delay business, and generally behave decently? The treasuries will sluggishly but diligently carry out the monarch's will. Moreover, it is still better to be an honest order than to fly out of service, or even fall under investigation.

No efforts of the king and those close to him? And they don't exist either? Immediately a hundred clerks and a thousand clerks begin to steal twice and thrice, rewarding themselves for the “abstinence” of the times of Sophia and Golitsyn. And this, in turn, is reflected in the lives of tens of thousands of people—read, the entire service class.

Did Russia know about all this when she went not to Moscow, to Sofia, but to the Trinity-Sergius Lavra, to the Naryshkins? Well, of course, she knew, and if she could not put it into words, she felt, understood not verbally, but at the level of emotions. And how could you not know all this?

Well, here is the choice...

HOW IS THE CONSPIRACY?!

Yes!!! But what about the mysterious “muzhiks in the bushes” from whom the frightened Peter galloped away? But they were never found, these men, and it is completely incomprehensible whether they existed at all or not. Those three vagabonds caught in the middle of the Kremlin - they definitely were, they were seen by many people. But the hidden killers of young Peter, sent by enemies to deprive Russia of its trembling hope, absolutely no one has seen these, except for the one who brought the news - they say, hide

32

They waited and waited ... And a completely serious question arises - did they exist at all, these messengers of Sophia invisible to anyone? Several hypotheses are possible here.

1. There was an attempt, but for some reason it failed, and the criminals, discovered by the guard, fled.

It is unlikely that Sophia was so noble that she did not even allow the thought of murderers sent to her brother. But then why didn't they take advantage of his absence in Kukuy? After all, Peter just returned from Kukuy very shortly before they ran in to him, they told about the waiting killers. He traveled most often alone or with a very small number of people. If you're going to make an assassination attempt, it's hard to find a better time and chance. But many people knew about trips to Kukuy, and there was no way to calculate the route

difficulties.

You can, of course, plunge into fiction, tell a more interesting story - how progressive archers received a reactionary task to kill Peter, but were unable to deprive Russia of its support and hope. They deliberately showed themselves to the guards - in order to fail the task as if by accident, and to save the beloved progressive monarch by everyone.

But if you do not hit this kind of "psychological" nonsense - in general, a really unlikely option.

2. The guard encountered some vagabonds or robbers, but these vagabonds or robbers had nothing to do with Sophia and never received any task to kill Peter.

This option is already more likely; at least it can be taken seriously. It is very possible that this was the case.

3. Natalya Kirillovna herself organized screams about the killers, about the collision of the patrol with the armed and those hiding. For what? At least two versions have the right to life here.

One was to frighten his son, to make him think more about his own safety, to go to Kukuy with an armed company, and not alone with Menshikov or even in

33

common to one. If so, the consequences of her educational move turned out to be much stronger than expected.

The second version is that Medvedikha just very well calculated all the possible consequences of her move and got exactly what she wanted. Indeed, the situation is ripe! Peter is married, it is already possible to transfer power to him, and it is time to clear the way to the throne. How to clear? Best of all - provocation! Because simply gathering your army and attacking Sophia's troops is a very dubious act. He is also morally

flawed, and yet the ruler needs at least a shadow of law so that he can safely enjoy power.

He is politically flawed, dubious. Such an act can very easily turn into just the fact that the noble militia will take the side of the offended Sophia. Then the military class of Russia will strike not at Sophia, but precisely at Peter and Natalya Kirillovna.

Organize the matter in such a way as to end everything with one instant blow? What if one doesn't work? But what about when Peter sits on the throne, still warm after Sophia? No, no, the ruler needs a reason to become a ruler, he needs at least a shadow of law resting on his power ...

In general, the best thing is not to plan a military operation, and this is not a woman's occupation. It's better to plan just a cunning intrigue so that Sophia would be the first to attack or, at worst, "attack" ... any, the most primitive podnadka, one that in the murderers lurking behind the outskirts. The killers were just expected almost every day ...

And of course, it couldn't have been easier to scare half to death the not quite sane, neurotic to the limit Peter - just at the right moment and just in the right measure.

## NEW POWER SYSTEM

Having sent Sofya and Vasily Golitsyn into exile, the Naryshkins did not even think to touch the "first

34

tsar" Ivan. Firstly, if Sophia was plotting against Peter, she wanted to shed her own blood, then Ivan certainly did not want this. Even if it was falsely erected on him, no one would believe it anyway, because Ivan was a man, perhaps a weak-minded man, but, in any case, kind and calm. And many times he persuaded both of them to put up - both Peter and Sophia (as if it was in them themselves!).

Yes, and he was not a hindrance to anyone, a kind and stupid king, quietly sitting on his throne and sitting and meekly signing everything that they just slipped him. Ivan died very early, almost reaching thirty, in the autumn of 1696. Until his death, both kings sat side by side at official ceremonies, on a specially made HOM "double" throne. Foreign diplomats even addressed Ivan as an older, "more important" tsar. Peter complained that "brother Vanka" "from

nose stinks" and that he was "an utter fool", but he could not break the ceremony. He meekly sat out if he could not escape.

And most importantly, the brother did not interfere with his rule at all. Her own mother interfered, and when she died, there were no obstacles for a young, active nature. Ivan did not even really understand what his brother was doing, and it would not even have occurred to him to interfere with Peter's actions.

So since the autumn of 1696, Peter | Alekseevich was the only king of Muscovy. Not because he was preparing for a dynastic war and managed to win it, but because he was the banner of the victorious clan. He was the son of the matriarch of this clan, and very possibly the poisoner of his brother. Not because he was preparing to reign, and, of course, not because he intended to carry out some kind of reforms.

Peter's chance to become king | appeared after the death of his father and older brother. The chance was realized due to the cunning intrigue of the mother. He became king as the banner of invariance and conservatism. A direct consequence of his coming to power was the rule of the gray and thieving clan of the Naryshkins, the collapse of what had been done by his predecessor.

nicknames.

35

Calling a spade a spade, Peter I, the youngest son of Alexei Mikhailovich Romanov, accidentally became the Russian tsar, and in this sense, the accidental fate of Muscovy and all of Russia.

Let us ask ourselves the question - who was this king?

A person with what training and with what personal qualities? After all, now incredibly much depended on his personal qualities, an unlimited monarch.

Chapter 2

## UPBRINGING

There were the most important reasons why Peter, even after the death of his mother in 1694, for a long time almost did not manage the state. One of them is the complete lack of systematic education. Fedor, heir to the throne, and Sophia were taught by Simeon of Polotsk, a monk from Western Rus', who graduated from the Kiev-Mohyla Academy. The most educated person who wrote poetry in Russian, Polish, Latin, staged edifying plays written with his own hand and published collections of sermons.

Indeed, he very much had something to teach the prince and the princess. He hadn't been interested in Peter since birth - it was believed that there was no point in wasting time and effort on the education of a younger prince, who would never sit on the throne anyway. This approach is neither humane nor particularly sensible. In

our more just and enlightened age, he will have few supporters. But then very often the heir was given a much better education than the rest of the royal children. For Peter, however, the sexton, Nikita Zotov, was considered quite sufficient. A wonderful description has been preserved of how Zotov was made Peter's teacher. We know about this from the notes of a certain Krekshin, who, out of love and reverence for Peter, collected any news, messages, documents, papers for about thirty years - if only they had at least some relation to Peter.

schenie.

37

According to the old Moscow custom, Peter began to be taught from the age of five. His elder brother and godfather, Fyodor, said more than once to his stepmother, Tsarina Natalya (who would have been only 10 years older than himself): "It's time, empress, to teach the godson." The queen asked Fedor to find a teacher "meek, humble, knowledgeable of the Holy Scriptures."

Tsar Fyodor Alekseevich's close associate, Fyodor Sokovnin, pointed out to the tsar a suitable "meek and humble husband, and skillful in writing and writing" - Nikita Moiseev's son Zotov, clerk of the Great Parish.

The tsar granted him to his hand and examined him in the presence of Simeon of Polotsk. Simeon approved Zotov's reading and writing, and Sokovnin then took Zotov to Tsar Alexei's widow, Natalia. Natalia Kirillovna received him, holding Pyotr by the hand, and said:

"I know that you have a good life and are skilled in Divine Scripture; I give you my only son.

Zotov burst into tears from excitement, fell to his knees  
with words:

"I am not worthy, mother, to accept such a treasure!"

The queen granted him to her hand and ordered him to begin training the next day.

An idyllic picture, nothing to say here! So idyllic that it's even somehow embarrassing, having told it, to immediately investigate who accustomed whom to drunken drinking: Nikita Zotov Petra or vice versa?! From which, among other things, follows the confirmation of the wisdom expressed by Ivan Turgenev: "Friend Arkady, do not speak beautifully"! As a rule, telling beautiful idylls

intended only to hide some unsightly facts. And Nikita Zotov was either originally a bitter drunkard, or Peter made him so, what can you do ?!

Of course, the most natural question may arise: how could a six-, at most ten-year-old kid get Nikita Zotov drunk?! And it's very simple. Himself, with his own hands of a seven-year-old child, he, of course, could not cope with the frail, but quite adult Zo

1 Turgenev I.I. Fathers and Sons. M., 2002. S. 39. 38

Comrade, who entered into some kind of, but a male adult force ... But "on the other hand" Peter had amusing troops, and he used them quite skillfully, as befits a military leader.

Peter wanted to run and play, he literally could not sit still for a minute. Book teaching required (and still requires) attention, perseverance, and time. Zotov demanded that Peter sit at the table and learn letters, read and count. And then Peter ordered the amusing soldiers to catch Zotov, tie him to the trunk of a thick tree. Do not screw it up, as it is done in films about Indians! Zotov was one of the very few people to whom Peter was nevertheless humane, and they treated him more pleasantly. Nikita Zotov was tightly tied with a rope around his waist so that he could not get loose and run away, and the other end of the rope was attached to a tree trunk (this is how a goat is tied to a peg).

And so that the first teacher would not be bored, a decent eggplant with sivu khoi was left within his reach. There was nothing left for Nikita Zotov to do, because Peter ran away with amusing things for the whole day, to do more exciting things. Tied up, Zotov, having nothing to do, kept kissing and kissing the eggplant until he got into a wonderful state of mind, and then fell asleep. Good Petya Romanov, the future Tsar Peter I, even left rags for Zotov, so that there would be something to lie down on, so as not to bare ground!

Here is the tank, according to one version, and poor Nikita Zotov drank himself.

Another version is that Nikita had been drinking before, although so far in moderation. Noticing that Pyotr was very "reactive", Nikita began to give him a "sip" of his favorite drink. The vodka deafened Peter, he sat more still, and Nikita finished the lesson ... That's how Peter and

started to sleep.

I will not insist on the fidelity of any of these versions, but I will note that they can be both valid at the same time. To the incredibly early initiation of Peter to alcohol, to his burning interest in sivukha, we

we'll be back, for now I'll note - well, of course, not really

39

One could learn a lot from Nikita Moiseevich Zotov.

Peter went through the alphabet with Zotov, the Book of Hours, the Psalter, even the Gospel and the Apostle. As a teenager and as an adult, he could read and sing in the kliros no worse than a deacon, he knew by heart large chunks of the Gospel and the Apostle. Little teaching? Well ... From Nikita Zotov it was impossible to "adopt" more.

Peter loved picture books! Especially for him, Zotov asked the queen to give out "books with kunshtami" and historical works from the palace library. Natalya Kirillovna allowed the borrowing of books and gave the task of painting to the masters from the Armory to make illustrations that were of interest to Peter. Gradually, whole "amusing notebooks" were compiled, where soldiers, cities, wars, weapons, battles, texts of fairy tales and entire illustrations were depicted in colors and gold.

new stories.

But the pictures are pictures, and Peter wrote with terrible mistakes. Even the teachings of the Dutchman Timmerman - already a teenager, in 1687, did little to fix it. Timmerman showed him all kinds of curiosities, such as an astrolabe or a compass, and this greatly amused Peter. But as before, he found it difficult to do absolutely everything that required even the slightest effort, and when he was curious about everything entertaining, he made nightmarish mistakes.

People often talk about Peter's interest in everything new, about the thirst for knowledge, and so on. But the fact of the matter is that Peter sought not so much to engage in this "new" as to have fun. Any experienced teacher knows the difference very well and literally feels it.

The same was the case with the knowledge of languages. Peter could speak quite fluently, read and write in non-Metz and Dutch, understood French, but was terribly illiterate in foreign languages. Actively communicating with the Germans or with foreigners who lived among the Germans and knew the German language well (for example, Scottish officers), Peter simply wildly interfered with the Russian language with German and Dutch - if only

40

he was understood and he at least approximately understood the conversation NIKOV.

In letters to Menshikov, Peter often wrote in Russian



in letters such German phrases as "Meine libste kama rat" or "mein best frint" (by the way, mixing German with Dutch in one phrase), and the Arkhangelsk governor F.M. Apraksin called Mt Neg Tsetsuerpeug AgsVapdel, contriving to again mix the German with the Frenchman Kim.

And Franz Lefort in 1696 wrote to Peter "in Russian", but in Latin letters:  
"Z|auots VodP \$30 And rgesVo! 54ogoma ots doggo4 wogope{\$. Ba}  
Vos #5o 4th start | Wed Mozsua \$Aogouots Biy. Most likely, Peter understood!

In essence, Peter was not really literate in any language - neither Russian nor German.

It is customary to note the enormous knowledge of Peter in various fields ... But what did this knowledge consist of? This is either practical skills, for example, the ability to work on various machines. Peter was proud of his ability to carve out any detail that is needed in shipbuilding, when building a sea ship. A story is known when he brought a Dutch ship to St. Petersburg, having performed the work of a pilot.

Or they are scraps of knowledge, without a system, without philosophical or general scientific training. So, a dump of various "curious" information - a piece from here, a piece from there... By the same, if I may say so, principle, the famous Kunstkamera was created - this is not at all a museum of Natural History, not a universal museum of "everything in the world" (as British). It is a collection of curiosities - everything that surprises, shocks, disgusts or attracts with its painful deviation from the norm. Based on materials, for example, from the Zoological Museum or the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography, one can get an idea of entire sections of science... but not from the materials of the Kunstkamera.

Peter | did not show any stable attitude towards the sciences and arts; all his "scientific knowledge" is unsystematic and does not at all show serious knowledge in any area of culture or science.

41

## PETER'S STRANGE PHOBIA

Peter is generally very characteristic of all sorts of "phobias", sometimes extremely bizarre. Among them is a fierce hatred of old families. Where?! How can the tsar, the first nobleman in the state, literally come out with hatred for the aristocracy?! In an effort to justify and whitewash Peter at any cost, this is sometimes explained by "heavy impressions of childhood." They say that Peter was cruelly offended by the boyars in childhood, and this scar remained with him for ALL LIFE.

It is much more difficult to point out the specific circumstances of these grievances: who humiliated poor Petrushcha, when and for what reason? Because history has not preserved any concrete evidence of this kind. Even having lost his father very early, at the age of three and a half, Peter did not grow up as an orphan at all. One can (and should) say a lot of bad things about his mother: she is irresponsible, and stupid, and cruel, and incapable of dealing with state affairs, and she was never shy about means. But Natalya Kirillovna loved her son and daughters, took care of them and would never give offense.

From the age of three, Peter lived far from the court, in the village of Preobrazhensky, where only boyars who were close to the Naryshkins or who were members of their clan traveled. The events of "Khovanshina" in 1682 could form a psychological scar in people stronger than a 10-year-old boy. Then, in front of his eyes, his beloved uncle Matveev was killed.

But even here, firstly, no one personally offended Peter, and secondly, the archers were the offenders, and the noblemen, Mikhail Dolgoruky or Artamon Matveev, were offended by us. On the blood-drenched Red Square on May 15, 1682, it would have been more natural to become a hater of the black people and a defender of the ancient nobility.

Prince Boris Kurakin cites a much more real reason for this phobia in his "History of Tsar Peter Alekseevich": "The beginning of the fall of the first surnames must be seen in Peter's childhood, when the kingdom was ruled by Tsarina Natalya Kirillovna and her brother Lev Naryshkin. In that reign, the name of the princes was mortally hated

42

taken and destroyed both from the tsarist majesty and from the persons of those rulers who were around him, from the fact that all these gentlemen, Naryshkins, Streshnevs, Golovkin, were from the houses of the lowest and most wretched gentry, and they always inspired him from a young age years against great families.

In general, Peter was brought up by those who sat in the Preobrazhensky and then seized power. The Naryshkin clan, which did not descend from princes at all, but from the archery elite and from officers in the regiments of the new system. And they brought up the shaft, of course, in their own taste.

However, in addition to direct suggestions and inciting the circle in which Peter was brought up, he also had other, purely personal reasons not to like educated and well-mannered people: he himself was not one of them. You can treat the highest nobility as you like, because love and dislike for any social group is a personal matter. But, in any case, the nobility is both well educated and well brought up. Peter had a poor command even of his own

learned the four rules of arithmetic only by the age of 16, he did not know literature and art at all. This already limited his possibilities, reduced the number of interlocutors and created a complex of inferiority.

But, in the end, it was possible to sit at the table and say nothing at all, but only smile and depict with all your appearance how "royal mercy" is poured out on those around you. But that's the point - and to behave at the table ... in general, Peter also did not know how to behave in society. He did not know how to do the most elementary things that were obligatory for an educated person of that time. He did not know how to give a chair and did not know how to sit down beautifully or accept a plate from a servant; did not know how to use a napkin, but a pulp and a fork.

In 1697, going to Europe together with the "Great EMBASSY" UNDER the name of Peter Mikhailov, Peter met in the town of Coppenburg with two noble ladies: the Elector of Brandenburg Sophia Charlotte and her mother, the Elector of Hanover, Sophia. The meeting took place on the initiative of the ladies, who then

43

wrote down their impressions in diaries: the Electors really wanted to see Peter, the "king of the barbarians." According to Sophia Charlotte, in the first minutes of the meeting, Peter covered his face with his hands and muttered: "I can't speak ..." But something else made a much stronger impression on the Elector: "It is also clear that he was not taught to eat neatly, but I liked his naturalness and not compulsion.

The Electors, unfortunately, began to judge by Peter the whole of Russia and all Russians, thereby establishing a disgusting tradition of seeing us as funny savages, a kind of "white Papuans", and considered Peter "charmingly wild." But after all, these are the Electors, thirsting for the exotic, and then the Golitsyns and Dolgorukis. You can't deceive your own people, and you won't pass for a "charming savage, natural and unconstrained" in their society. |

Moreover, Peter was completely incapable of maintaining secular conversation. For this, he simply did not know Russian and other languages well enough and did not know literature, history, culture, architecture at all ... in general, everything that is called such an indefinite word - culture.

In addition, Peter absolutely did not know how to take into account the personality of the interlocutor, at least to some extent apply to him, to talk about what this interlocutor might be interested in. He told the same electors about how he personally tortured the archers, and to one

to the Tolitsky priest - about how the Cossacks hang and impale the priests.

Of course, all this is connected with education in the circle of "the lowest and most miserable nobility," there are no words! But the most natural question arises - why didn't Peter himself change this state of affairs? In the end, it's not such a great burden to learn how to behave in society, read books, communicate with knowledgeable people ... Lo monosov, who at the age of 20 got into the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy, was also rude and wild .. the first years, and in some ways only the first months. He is not the first, he is not the last.

44

There is a magnificent dialogue in Turgenev:

"You see, I've been dislocated since childhood...

- Understand. But you're already 35... Go and put yourself back in!

Really. Why did Peter, neither at the age of 35 nor at 45, "shove himself back in"? Why didn't he educate himself, didn't attract the people needed for this? Why, until the end of his days, did he eat with his hands, slurp and yell loudly, point and point with his fingers, get drunk to the point of bestiality, scratch his head and fart at the table, frighten and insult his interlocutors?

And here's why...

## DISEASE HISTORY

All historians who have studied the era speak of Peter's serious neuropsychiatric illness. Some talk about this disease sympathetically, others not so much. This disease is associated with very different events in his life, but the diagnosis itself does not cause much doubt. Let me quote from a book by the American Massey, who generally perceives Peter extremely enthusiastically and writes all this not at all in order to somehow humiliate him: physical humiliation by illness. When Peter got excited or the stress of his hectic life became excessive, his face began to twitch involuntarily. The severity of this disorder, which usually affected the left side of the face, could fluctuate: sometimes it was a small facial tic, lasting a minute or two, and sometimes real convulsions, which began with a contraction of the muscles of the left side of the neck, after which the spasm covered the entire left side. faces, and the eyes rolled back so that only the whites were visible. With the most severe, violent attacks

the groin was affected and the left hand - it ceased to obey and involuntarily twitched; such an attack ended only when Peter lost consciousness. With only professional descriptions of symptoms, we can never be certain.

45

neither the disease nor its causes. Most likely, Peter suffered from small epileptic seizures - a relatively mild neuropsychiatric disorder, which in severe form corresponds to true epilepsy, manifested in the so-called grand mal seizure. As far as is known, Peter was not subject to this extreme manifestation of the disease: no one saw him fall to the floor and foam at the mouth or lose control of bodily functions. In his case, the irritation originated in the part of the brain that controls the muscles on the left side of the face and neck. If the source of irritation did not disappear, or at least did not weaken, the neighboring parts of the brain also became excited, which caused involuntary, convulsive movements of the left shoulder of the arm.

It is even more difficult, without knowing for sure the nature of the disease, to pinpoint its exact cause. Peter's contemporaries and later historical writers offer a range of opinions. Some attribute these convulsions to the traumatic effect of the horror that he experienced in 1682 ... Others found the origins of the illness in the shock he suffered seven years later, when Peter was awakened in the middle of the night in Preobrazhenskoye with the news that the archers were going to kill him himself. Still others sinned against unbridled drunkenness, to which the tsar became addicted with the light hand of Lefort - what is worth one All-Drunken Cathedral! There was even a rumor leaked to the West from the German settlement that the tsar's illness was caused by the poison that Sophia sent him, trying to clear her way to the throne. However, the most plausible cause of epilepsy, especially if the patient has never received a strong blow to the head, which may cause a scar on the brain tissue, is considered to be a prolonged and severe inflammation suffered by him. In November 1693 - January 1694, Peter had a strong fever for several weeks - then many even feared for his life. Such inflammation, for example, encephalitis, can cause the formation of a local scar on the brain, subsequently irritating the damaged area under the influence of special psychological stimuli.

46

there is an impetus to seizures of the kind that Peter suffered. The illness deeply affected the personality of Peter, it largely explains his extraordinary speed.

vanity in the presence of strangers, unaware of his convulsions and therefore unprepared for this spectacle.

I do not pretend to know the medical side of de la - encephalitis, trauma, scarring, excitation of brain regions. But I still have to correct R. Massey, and in three very important details.

1. Not only epileptic seizures testify to Peter's serious illness. The expression of the bulging eyes of the king made no less impression on his contemporaries. "The habit of looking after himself and restraining himself gave his large wandering eyes a sharp, even wild expression, which caused an involuntary trembling in a weak-nerved person" ^.

In general, Peter has so many symptoms of "mental injury" that it is not easy to even list them. Take, for example, his bouts of uncontrollable and completely irrational rage. Falling into a rage, Peter could throw himself at people with a reddened, distorted face, beat them with anything and anywhere. Once, at a feast at Franz Lefort's on September 14, 1698, Peter began to shout terribly at Shein: "Thief! Thief! How many colonels have you sold, damn son?!"

It was rumors that Peter had heard that Shein had been promoted to colonel for money. Without saying a word further, Pyotr, with a brown face, brandished his sword, and Shein barely managed to dodge it, the sword only cut the dishes on the table. "This is how I will cut your regiment, and skin you alive!" And Peter raised his hand for the second blow. Nikita Zotov and Fyodor Yuryevich Romodanovsky rush to prevent the murder, and then Peter strikes Zotov on the head. Happiness that the blow fell flat, Not a whale only badly hurt. Romodanovsky Peter touched

1 Massey R. Peter the Great. T. 1-3. Smolensk, 1996.

2 Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 2. Rostov-on-Don, 2000. S. 487.

47

with a sword on his arm and almost cut off his fingers. Most likely, the tsar would have killed Shein if Franz Lefort, the owner of the feast, had not rushed to the rescue. It's good that Peter beat him only with fists and feet.

In such cases, Peter could pose a serious danger to others. He hit Lefort badly in the head; Menshikov, who tried to drag him away from Le Fort, broke his nose with his elbow. It's good that with the elbow, and not with a sword, it's good that the nose, and not the windpipe - that's

all that can be said about this. That is, later, probably, Peter would have sobbed that he had personally killed his best friend Franz Lefort, but at the very moment when it HAPPENED, he could well have killed.

Yes! Governor Shein disappeared somewhere after this story. I will not say anything: for sure nothing is known. But that he disappeared, that's for sure, and that his trade in positions has never been proven, that's also for sure.

And later it happened many times. In 1703, during the storming of Narva, Muscovite soldiers carried out such a "terrible massacre without mercy for women and children" in the city that even Solovyov, emphatically loyal to Peter, is compelled to write about it. According to the Stalinist kept woman, Alexei Tolstoy, it turns out that the wife of the commandant of Narva, Fru Horn, is almost to blame for the fact that she was killed by Muscovite soldiers. Muscovy, and then the Russian Empire, is a truly amazing country, where non-commissioned officers' wives flog themselves, and the wives of enemies strangle themselves. However, sometimes even more mysterious things are connected with it: for example, on the same day of the assault on Narva, several hundred young women raped themselves.

Trying to stop the robberies and murders, Peter fell into a terrible rage and stabbed one of his own soldiers with a sword; the rest fled. According to the same S.M. Solovyov, Peter then showed this sword to the inhabitants of Narva with the words: "Do not be afraid! This is not a Swede

1 Soloviev S.M. History of Russia since ancient times. Book \|. M., 1962. S. 10.

48

Skye, this is Russian blood! In what language Peter addressed the inhabitants of Narva, Sergei Mikhailovich is silent.

There will be no comments.

Or take attacks of the same irrational, hysterical panic. It seems that Peter was ashamed of his stampede from Preobrazhensky to the Trinity-Sergius Lavra ... But, firstly, he did not leave the walls of the Lavra in the morning. Secondly, then the same stampede will be repeated more than once or twice. There is a story about how Peter fled in panic, returning from the "Great Embassy" in 1696, frightened of who knows what.

Just as hysterically, Peter will run from under Narva in 1700. But in 1700, he runs in panic, leaving the army, no longer a boy of 17 years old, but an adult uncle of 28 years old. And not just running, panic attacks and writhing are repeated for several months.

Then, among other things, there will be a decree to take monks "prettier", that is, healthier, as soldiers, and the famous decree to remove church bells. The simplest calculation is that the Swedes captured 177 gun barrels near Narva, 116 of them were of an obsolete model (very heavy and, moreover, of small caliber). In total, there were more than 1000 guns in Muscovy at that time ... There was not the slightest need to urgently pour new guns at all. And to remove the bells... You see, bell copper and gun copper have different composition, and it is very difficult to pour bell copper into gun copper. This can only be done with the help of special additives. There were simply no such additives in Muscovy, they had to be imported, and in 1703, out of 90 thousand poods of "harvested" bell copper, only 8 thousand poods were poured into guns. The rest of the bells were lying around, but, of course, they never returned to their proper place - to the bells. |

So we have to come to the conclusion that there was nothing of this: neither the urgent need to remove the bells, nor the stupid resistance of obscurantist priests who do not understand the priority needs of the state.

And there was the wildest arbitrariness, not forced by any necessity. And one can only guess if it was

49

only a hysteria that stretched out for months!, by itself, or another of Peter's phobias manifested itself - his persistent hatred of the church. Well, he did not like everything that was somehow connected with the church, including the ringing of bells. Well, it was unpleasant for him that the bells were ringing ... So he took the opportunity!

But in any case: what images make him react so hysterically and so inadequately? After all, it would be wrong to call Peter a cowardly person. He easily taught himself "not to bow" to the balls and grenades when firing, he behaved well during a storm on the White Sea in 1697, and was not afraid to participate in hand-to-hand combat. All his life he walked and traveled without protection, appearing in Le and where he could be in real danger. So stampede, hysteria is by no means cowardice, it is still a disease.

Or take his endless, to put it mildly, quirks... For example, Peter [was terribly afraid of cockroaches. Why?! The cockroaches were definitely not an unfaithful army, like the Streltsy, and did not kill people close to him. In the then Rus', no one thought to fight cockroaches, on the contrary, their abundance in the house was considered a sure sign of wealth. The ceiling is moving over the stove, cockroaches are falling from the ceiling into a pot of cabbage soup - these are signs of everyday life, the mention of which will turn more than one face of my dear readers, modern



many tidy housewives: "To my house! .." But our ancestors thought differently, and Peter's behavior is explained somehow differently. In any case, he had such a phobia, and if Peter stayed in an unfamiliar hut, those rakans in it were thoroughly swept out.

He was no less afraid of high ceilings and spacious rooms. It is easy to judge the tastes of Peter, his requirements for housing by the "Peter's House" in the modern Summer Garden in St. Petersburg.

1 Doctors do not recognize the term "protracted tantrum". For them, hysteria is a single, not very long attack. Therefore, I do not insist on my definition, let the doctors give a more accurate one. — A.B.

50

It is supposed to speak of the modesty of the Emperor... But what strikes me the most is the narrowness of the rooms and the low ceilings. And if Peter still had to sleep or live in rooms with high ceilings, a canvas canopy was pulled up for him, depicting a low ceiling.

"But" that's what Peter loved, he loved so much! For example, he adored vinegar and olive oil and ate them in huge quantities. If, however, he noticed that someone was avoiding eating these dishes at feasts, he would go into a terrible frenzy, order the person to open his mouth wide and forcefully pour in a huge bottle of vinegar or olive oil.

As you can see, with a careful analysis of the material, the symptoms do not decrease.

2. Peter received head injuries. During the next "fun battle" a cannon grenade exploded near the king himself, and he miraculously survived, but received a severe concussion.

According to other sources, one of the "amusing scorers" out of inexperience scored too much charge into the cannon. The gun was either torn apart or thrown away, the king received a strong blow to the head and lost consciousness.

So the disease could also arise (or worsen) because of this.

3. As you can see, both contemporaries and historians name the most respectable, most compelling reasons for the onset of the disease - and with a terrible scene, when Matveev was torn away from loved ones and thrown onto spears substituted from below (ten-year-old Peter had shreds from his beard in his hands) . And with illness. And even with poison, according to sent by Sophia.

But all this is unlikely, because even before this uprising, until May 15, 1682, the boy sometimes behaved, speaking softly, strangely - for example, he could not sit still for a minute at all. I just wasn't able to make the effort to sit still long enough to draw a picture or listen to a short story. "Lack of fixation of attention" in children older than 2-3 years is considered by psychiatrists as

51

a symptom of a rather serious neurosis, among other things, interfering with the education and upbringing of the child ... Which was the case.

At four, five, seven years old, Peter was already very fond of breaking something, breaking it, throwing it on the ground. He adored, for example, breaking dishes, and if they didn't allow him, he fought hysterically, squealed, pounded on the ground and on the hands of the people holding him.

Another symptom is neurotic movements of the head, when the prince, out of excitement or fright, lifted up his little face to the sky, twitched all his facial muscles, could not control the trembling in his hands. Once an archer, looking at Peter shaking his head, said:

- Well, a cat! Clean cat!

And this was six years before the events of 1682, when Peter was barely 4 years old.

So it is unlikely that the murder of Matveev became the root cause of Peter's mental disorder, and it is generally not clear whether the disease was acquired from him or congenital. Or a whole bunch of diseases?

An equally striking sign of Peter's ill health is his inability to concentrate, stop, and think deeply about something. When talking about Peter's incredible ability to work, one often forgets to clarify: no one has ever seen him reading a serious book (even on his favorite maritime business) or trying to delve into the intricacies of jurisprudence, theology or literature. Anything complicated simply did not attract his attention, and he did not waste time and energy on it. Peter never walked alone, he was never found immersed in thoughts (the exception was the last two or three years of his life, when Peter fell into a terrible depression). He also never was alone in church, he did not pray secretly, "his own."

Even if the story about how Zotov soldered little Peter is false - otherwise he could not sit still, it proves that these personality traits of Peter appeared already at the age of 5-6. |

The very inability to focus on anything definite, the superficiality, the irresistibility itself can serve as material for a diagnosis. After all, on

52

there are no people in the world who are fundamentally unteachable. There is not and cannot be a mentally normal boy in the world who cannot be taught either correct writing or socially acceptable behavior. Here the very fact of not learning speaks of a serious mental deviation

niyakh.

Even during the so-called rest, Peter needs to be noisy, crowded, to dance, shout, cry and sing around, and the noisier the better. For him, too, during the hours of "rest" speech excitement, the inability to stop, is most characteristic. Peter, as it were, does not give himself time to think about something serious.

Historians tend to perceive Peter's habit of constantly rushing somewhere almost romantically: after all, it was impossible in another way, by other means, to "raise Russia on its hind legs", build a fleet and smash the sustats. According to V.O. Klyuchevsky, "under 50, if he bothered to look at his life, he would see that he was always going somewhere."

It is difficult to say how necessary it was - to rush somewhere all the time, and not to control from the same Transfiguration Palace or from the Palace of Facets. But of course, there was no need to constantly run out of the room at feasts to stretch. Apparently, Peter simply organically could not sit in one place; something kept driving him over the horizon.

But even if he didn't go, didn't rush anywhere, Peter was also "busy" all the time, and all of Peter's "business" and all the "occupations" that we know about are the simplest mechanical movement, fussiness, running around, hand movements and no gami. He seems to be avoiding any possibility of being alone with himself, with nature, with God, or with human wisdom. He fills up all his time, filling it with this, for the most part completely aimless, movement.

'  
Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 2. Ros  
Tov-on-Don, 2000, p. 488.

53

Someone may be indignant: why "completely aimless"?! After all, Peter was always engaged in state

other things! He wrote 20,000 decrees alone!

#### ABOUT PETER'S DECREES

But these 20,000 decrees are a clear example of Peter's mental illness. The king really wrote these decrees all the time, including in the least suitable places: for example, during trips, in a cart, in a chicken hut on a bench, or sitting right on a log or on a stump while the horses are harnessed.

Like, well, what dedication! What devotion to duty! But among the decrees of Peter there are many such, for example: "A subordinate in front of his superior must look dashing and foolish, so as not to embarrass his superiors with his understanding."

Or this: "Since a lot of idlers in Gishpan trousers are wandering along the Neva prospect, the police will take them and beat them with a whip mercilessly until these Gishpan trousers turn into complete scraps."

Or here is a decree that Peter should be informed about the beginning of each fire half an hour before it starts. It is difficult to understand what its administrative or any other value is.

Even if we take decrees that are more solid, both in size and in meaning... Among such decrees there is also a decree on the universal, nationwide, transition to the use of a Lithuanian scythe instead of a sickle. Peter came to the conclusion that it takes a long time to reap the fields with a sickle, it is unproductive, and he diligently writes a decree. Most of Peter's decrees are very similar to each other in structure; first, it is written about what made Peter issue this decree. This is, so to speak, an explanatory note in the decree, a kind of declaration. Citizens are explained in detail how wrong they are in sewing trousers, gathering bread, building ships and living with their wives.

In one of the later decrees, it was even explained that "Our people are like children of ignorance for the sake of who will never take up the alphabet when they are not forced from the master

54

there are ... but when they learn, then they thank you. As you can see, it even has its own philosophy.

Then it is stated what, in fact, Peter wants from his subjects; so to speak, a detailed instruction - what exactly is required to do or not to do. And in conclusion, there is a frightening set of punishments, a list of tortures and executions to which everyone who decides not to FOLLOW the decree should be subjected.

A.S. Pushkin used to say that Peter's decrees "as if written with a whip." The opinion is fair, but this is not enough - Peter's decrees were written without any regard for reality, and the execution of most of these decrees is simply harmful.

Examples? Please! Here are at least two cases where the execution of Peter's decrees led to tragedies.

First example. This is when Peter, by a special decree, ordered to change the width of the looms. The fact is that the bulk of the canvases were made in those days in a handicraft way, placing a loom in a peasant or townsman's hut. The machine was narrow, because the hut itself was cramped and crowded. The width of the machine, of course, did not affect either the quantity made or the quality of the canvas; only later, when shirts were already sewn from the linen, it was necessary to separately cut and sew two narrow pieces of fabric. This technique became so commonplace that even in the 20th century, illustrations for children's books often depicted just such shirts - with a clearly visible seam in the middle of the chest. Because this technique survived until the 20th century, and in the 10th century, even some of the factory calicoes were produced narrow, familiar to buyers.

But narrow fabrics survived the era of Peter's decrees in the wilderness, in the countryside, in the provinces, where these decrees did not reach, where no one read them, and if they read them, they did not follow them. For the weaving manufactories near Kholmogory, the decree turned out to be disastrous, because there were simply no wide looms, accepted in European manufactories. And even if they were imported from abroad (which there was not the slightest need), there was nowhere to put such machines.

Kholmogory weaving enterprises worked according to the principle of the CIP of "scattered manufactory" - the workers were given

55

raw materials, paid, and they developed products at home, and then handed it over to the merchant. This is in Europe (and even then not always and not everywhere) workers came from home to production, where and there were machines.

As a result, the northern weaving manufactories fell into complete decline.

In addition, during his trip to the north, Peter discovered a "terrible" thing: savages from Kholmogory made "wrong" lines of the ship! Not like in Holland! True, shipbuilders did these "wrong" contours in everything not out of ignorance, but because they built ships adapted to sailing in the arctic seas. The Dutch fleet hardly even sailed into the Baltic Sea and did not climb north of Edinburgh; yes, the Dutch ships went faster - but they could never sail in such latitudes and in such ice conditions,

like the ships of the Pomors.

Peter's decree, which commanded to break down all the "wrong" ships and build in their place the "correct" ones, with the same hull contours as in Holland, led to catastrophic consequences. Even more catastrophic than the decree on the width of canvases. After all, there were hundreds of thousands of looms in Muscovy, and in order to break them all, it would be necessary that the entire army and the entire bureaucracy would not be engaged in anything else. Fortunately, Peter had other things to do.

But there were only a few hundred ships, all of them were based in just a few ports and were very noticeable. The ships, accordingly, were broken, hastily, others began to build from the damp forest, but when they were built, they did not possess the seaworthiness of the former ones at all. Russia, the Russian Pomorye, has forever lost its priority in the northern seas; its "know-how", which allowed it to compete very confidently with any foreigners and explore the Subarctic and even the Arctic.

This decree also affected the construction of ships that were supposed to sail along the Volga and the Caspian Sea. Caspian beads were built in several places along the Volga and along the Oka; the bus was a huge vessel with a displacement of up to 2,000 tons and a deck length of up to 60 meters.

56

For comparison, none of the caravels on which Columbus sailed to America had a displacement of more than 270 tons. The galleons, on which the wealth of America was exported to Spain, had a displacement of 800 to 1800 tons, and only a few of them reached the size of a Caspian bead. The displacement of most merchant ships of Holland and England, including those sailing to India, America, and the island of Java, did not exceed 300-500 tons. Against this background, even the koch, the Pomeranian lodia, with a displacement of up to 500 tons, differed very little from European ships in size, and the Caspian beads are much larger.

Peter's decrees destroyed the construction of these ships, and after 50, 100 years, it was necessary to start the fleet, as they say, from scratch.

Or here is a decree that landlords must inform about minerals that are hidden in their lands. If, however, the landlords hide these minerals with malicious intent—whip, exile, seizure of estates, demolition, disgrace! How the landowner, in the complete absence of special education, without training, himself finds out about these minerals - God knows. Yes, and what

exactly deposits and what to consider "deposits of useful art

soldered"? Let's say, good quality sand - "mineral" to consider? And if it is so small that it is suitable

what deposit is only for the estate itself?

A decree was even issued in which Peter explained in detail how to get married. How and when the engagement is made, how many weeks after it it is already possible to get married, that it is necessary to ask young people for their desires, and not "create marriage bonds" without them, "by parental consent alone .. And if someone disobeys, will marry not as written in the decree - then the groom, and the bride, and all relatives - with a whip, beat them into shackles, exile them to remote provinces ... in general, the usual set, repeated from decree to decree.

Those who would cover the roofs with boards instead of the tiles, shingles or turf introduced by decree should be whipped and exiled; those who put stoves on the floor and not on

57

special foundation; those who do not plaster ceilings with clay; who digs graves differently from Peter's instructions. Katorga threatened everyone who leathers shoes with tar rather than blubber, who does not go to church on Sundays, who rides unbridled horses and lets cattle out without supervision. In St. Petersburg, under the fear of hard labor, it was impossible to use rowing boats for crossing, but it was possible only to sail; detailed instructions on how to repair, clean, paint and dry sailing boats took up three pages of text. A priest who conducts a church service carelessly, and during the liturgy does not "practice the thought of God," was also threatened with a whip and exile.

Here, however, questions again arise: for example, where can one find the criterion for the negligence with which a priest conducts services, and how to determine whether he practiced divine thought? Determining whether the boat is painted correctly is still incomparably easier. Peter's decrees are very often so vague, they allow such broad interpretations that, on the basis of even this decree, it is quite possible to at least the entire Orthodox Church, and all parishioners, and all residents of St. and exile directly in rows and columns.

One can only rejoice that most of Peter's decrees were never implemented. Most of them simply did not get into the provincial offices - where the decrees had to be executed. And if they fell, then the local offices were afraid to do anything, and the provincial officials tried not to draw attention to themselves.

True, there was a case when they honestly tried to execute Peter's decree: the Vyatka governor Chaadaev honestly tried to fulfill another decree that the governor should

wives "take care of orphanages, academies and schools, as well as hospitals." There was no orphanage in patriarchal Vyatka; there were academies throughout Rus' in only two cities: in Moscow and in Kyiv. Voevoda founded only a school; found a place for her, teachers, but there were no students for the school. Then the governor went along the path,

58

which, probably, Peter himself would not have refused: the voivode sent soldiers and dragoons around the territory of the county so that they would catch the required number of teenagers suitable for their age as students. It was this attempt that went down in history as a case of escorting students to school under escort, and many scientists and writers spoke about this delirium, downright enthusiastically, as a most useful example. And so it was - the boys were taken under escort, forced to study. What did the forced pupils do? Have you crammed the primer? That's right, they ran home at the first opportunity, as soon as the soldiers gaped. It ended up that all but three fled, and we must give credit to the governor - he did not return exactly these fugitives, nor catch new "disciples", nor beat the parents of those who had escaped with a whip, but "covered" the event and the last three "disciples let go too.

And the population of the Vyatka province now knew very well that education is not an honorable duty, not a privilege of wealthy strata, not a path to success in life, but the hardest duty. So heavy that you can't do without soldiers ... And it's not difficult to guess what effect this had on people's mores.

Did Peter understand that he was issuing unnecessary, meaningless decrees and that it was impossible to fulfill all these decrees?

If you didn't understand, then, excuse me, what kind of king is he?

If you understood, but continued to disorganize your own state, you must ask the same question.

And if Peter | understood that his decrees were not needed anywhere and for anything and no one would execute them, then why did he continue to write them?

All the more famous are the texts of Peter, which are impossible to read - they were written while driving, when the cart was tossed from side to side and strange-looking lines appeared on the paper, separate indistinct signs. What is characteristic is that Peter never tried to restore these texts, that is, he did not at all try to use the fruits of his own work.

And one has to come to the conclusion as sad as it is inevitable: all this writing of decrees, including



le and on the road - is not at all the activity of a statesman. This is just an imitation of such activity. A kind of convulsions of a person who organically cannot stop, interrupt the eternal run to nowhere, a movement made for nothing.

However, in this stubborn, strained issuance of more and more new decrees, another feature of Peter appeared, which also cannot be called quite normal: the desire to delve into absolutely all aspects of the life of his subjects, to organize decisively everything and in no case allow someone or something would escape regulation.

One should not think that the author was the first to find these features of Peter, and before that no one suspected them. Everyone who dealt with the era knew it, although they interpreted it in different ways.

"Peter's misfortune is that he was left without any political consciousness, with only a vague and meaningless feeling that his power had no limits, but only dangers. This boundless emptiness of consciousness was not filled with anything for a long time. The artisanal nature of occupations learned from childhood, manual menial work interfered with reflection, diverted thought from objects that constitute the necessary material for political education, and in Peter a ruler grew up without rules that spiritualized and justified power, without elementary political concepts and moral restraints. Lack of judgment and moral instability, with genius abilities and extensive technical knowledge, were sharply evident to foreign observers of 25-year-old Peter, and it seemed to them that nature was preparing in him a good carpenter rather than a great sovereign.

True, here, too, Klyuchevsky certainly wants to justify Tsar Peter:  
"From childhood, badly directed morally and early spoiled physically, incredibly rude in upbringing and lifestyle, inhuman due to the terrible circumstances of his youth, at the same time he was

1 Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full of lectures. T. 2. Rostov-on-Don, 2000. S. 501-502.

full of energy, sensitive and observant by nature. These natural qualities somewhat restrained the shortcomings and vices imposed on him by the environment and life.

The circumstances of Peter's youth were whatever,

but only NOT "terrible", but convulsive, painful mobility, inability to stop, superficiality, inability to concentrate were with him all his life. When an adult needs to be entertained, occupied, carried away all the time, or he entertains himself with all his might, avoiding any opportunity to stop and think, this is a sign of ill health. The desire to MAINTAIN the "rule" all one's life is also the clearest sign of a neurosis, if not something more serious. But if only that were the case...

"Sick people are gluttonous and sexy"?

Contemporaries, then historians, were struck by the gluttony of the king. If Aleksey Mikhailovich was extremely moderate in food, and careful in eating, then Pyotr was miraculously gluttonous and unrestrained in food. |

And just as uncontrollably sexy, far beyond the bounds of decency. It seems that he simply could not resist the sight of any woman he liked, no matter who she was. For him, there were no decency, no rules of behavior at the table - in any society he champed, stuffed his mouth with food (from where it fell), tore food with his hands, not paying any attention to how the comrades reacted.

But in the same way, for Peter there were no rules of conduct in an even more delicate sphere of life. In the end, Peter simply took away his future second wife from Menshikov (perhaps there was also a provocation of Menshikov himself, but what a fact ...). Maybe Peter didn't understand what impression on everyone around him.

'  
Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 2. Ros  
Tov-on-Don, 2000. S. 502.

2 Child psychiatry. Textbook / Edited by E.G. Eidemiller. St. Petersburg: Piter, 20065, p. 79.

61

Have his novels now with an English actress, Now with a sailor girl from Saardam, now with the wives of his own subordinates? Or did he not care? In any case, if his father and older brother always kept themselves within the bounds of decency, then Peter did not follow their example.

The inability to restrain himself, the desire to take possession of literally every woman who could please him, led to a logical result: more than 100 bastards of Peter are known. Tellingly, he never helped them, explaining it very simply - they say, if they

worthy, they will break through.

Peter's pederasty was spoken quite openly even during his lifetime. And pundits, if they are arguing, are they exclusively about who has taken a fancy to Peter's pederasty - Franz Lefort or Alexander Danilovich Menshikov? Both assumptions are equally likely. It is difficult for me to judge how right Lev Samoilovich Klein is in directly linking sexual activity and pederasty, saying that increased sexuality is, in principle, a generic metaphor of pederasts. I won't argue because I don't know much about it.

But, in any case, few people at court did not know that Peter "lives in Menshikov's damn way," as one guards sergeant shouted. However, with many guards Peter lived in exactly the same way. Leaf propaganda praised the simplicity of Peter, who was so unpretentious, so unusually simple in his habits, that he often slept in the same bed with sailors and soldiers. Is it all about simplicity?

#### DIAGNOSIS

In fact, all these symptoms are very well known to specialists: they are symptoms of a condition called "Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder" and is referred to in the medical literature under the acronym ADD. The following wording is also possible: "attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder", or

1 Klein L.S. Another love. M., 2000. S. 207. 62

"Attention deficit disorder with hyperactivity disorder", but in all cases we are talking about the same phenomenon.

This syndrome occurs during oxygen starvation of the baby during protracted labor (Natalya had a protracted labor), with birth trauma to the head or trauma to the skull in the first years of life. "Symptomatic ADHD almost always appears before the age of 7, usually at 4 years. The average age of going to the doctor is 8-10 years: at this age, study and housework begin to require independence, purposefulness and perseverance from the child! I will not describe the symptomatology itself, because, using the example of Peter, it has already been described in great detail.

In fact, there is an "effective, inexpensive, and safe" treatment for the syndrome, but if the child is left untreated, the adult will almost certainly develop such unsympathetic manifestations as antisocial psychopathy and alcoholism. After all, children with ADHD are initially marginal, unable to integrate into a normal community.

Both children and adults do not know how to achieve the fulfillment of their desires, work purposefully, and adults develop such traits as "constant motor activity. The patient is constantly on the move, tense ... unable to do anything for a long time while sitting ... all the time on his feet, when he does not move, he feels uncomfortable but "; attention disorder; inability to complete the task; irascibility; stress intolerance; impulsiveness.

Doctors consider additional signs of ADHD to be "adultery, poor academic and work performance that does not correspond to the level of intelligence and education; alcohol and drug abuse."

Need comments??

. Wander P., Shader R. Attention deficit disorder with hyperactivity // Psychiatry / Ed. Sheider R. M., 1998. S. 222.

L Wender P., Shader R. Attention deficit disorder with hyperactivity // Psychiatry / Ed. Sheider R. M., 1998. S. 234

7 I would like to express my gratitude to my first wife and mother of my sons, neuropathologist Elena Alexandrovna Burovskaya, who helped me determine the probable diagnosis of Peter |. — A.B.

63

## POLITICAL MECHANICS

The 17th and 15th centuries are the time of the dominance of mechanics in the methodology of science. Of all branches of physics, it was precisely this that dominated, imposing its attitude to the world and other sciences and the rest of life. The Universe itself, in the view of scientists, was, as it were, a gigantic clock. Both Galileo Galilei and Michael Copernicus wrote about "celestial mechanics" and "mechanics of the spheres". Both society and man were presented in the form of simple mechanical schemes, quite unambiguous and reducible to the movements of the most elementary figures.

Mechanical scientists like Wolf, Puffendorf, Grotius, or their teachers Leibniz insisted on seeing the state as a gigantic machine. According to Leibnitz, in this machine "just as in a clock one wheel sets in motion another, so in the great state machine more than one collegium must set in motion another, and if everything is arranged with exact proportion and harmony, then the hand of life will show happy country

watch."

Wolf went perhaps even further: "The government

should have the right and duty to force everyone to work, fix wages and the price of goods, take care of the construction of good streets, strong and beautiful buildings, delight the eyes of the townsfolk with pictures pleasing to the eye, and ears with music, the singing of birds and the murmur of water, promote public entertainment with theatrical performances and other spectacles: to encourage poetry, to try about the school education of children, to see that adults are diligent in virtue and piety.

In the scientific school of the "regular state system", two lines were mixed: understanding of society and the state as a mechanism and the idea of a state that suppresses society and controls absolutely everything. As can be seen from the words of Wolf, even the singing of birds and the murmur of water.

I have no doubt that Peter really idolized the mechanical scientists; that the ideas of "regular

64

states" caused him complete delight. I do not doubt the testimonies of contemporaries that Peter corresponded with Leibniz for many years, and even invited Wolf to head the St. Petersburg Desciance Academy of Sciences.

Undoubtedly, Peter also liked the ideas about the duties of subjects, who, according to Wolf, "should readily and WILLINGLY do what the government finds necessary for the general well-being." Peter complained very much to the Electors Sofya and Sofya Charlotte about the stubbornness of his subjects: "under another, the whole skin will come off on the rack, but he keeps groaning and locking himself up." Wolf's idyllic subjects, who themselves do everything "readily and willingly," whatever the authorities tell them (for example, they raise themselves on the rack), could not help but please him extremely.

The legendary decree that the priest during the li turgy should "exercise in the thought of God" was born long before the reading of Wolf. Love for the simplified, elementary, devoid of the slightest trace of the second and third layers, manifests itself in Peter almost from birth.

This is evidenced by the incredible desire for regulations. Peter was very fond of compiling detailed descriptions of what needs to be done, after which and how exactly. Hard to teach the peasants to harvest bread, the townspeople to weave linen, merchants to trade, priests to think about God, and all together to sail boats and get married ...

This is also evidenced by Peter's constant, stubborn understanding of people as mechanisms or as inanimate tools. Supreme, pushed to the limit manifestation

This was the famous locking of batmen at night in cupboards. Apparently, these batmen were not for Peter what other people are for any adult; that is, they can be perceived as higher or lower, full-fledged or not quite, but in any case, these are beings with their own characters, will, and interests. For Peter, however, batmen, perhaps, would be something like writing implements or paper (or a whip, torture tongs - insert what seems more important to you): something that is quite appropriate

65

hide in a closet until needed. Probably, we would have done the same if pencils and pens had tried to escape and were not at our service in the morning.

No less evidence of the same is another, less well-known episode.

In May 1712, all the young nobles, "undersized", were summoned to Petersburg. "There was a review for all of us," recalls V.V. Golovin. - And the royal majesty himself looked, and deigned to define us by analysis into three: the first, who are older - to serve as soldiers, the middle ones - across the sea, to Holland, for maritime navigational science, and the youngest - to the city of Revel, in science." No personal inclinations were taken into account, and even the state of health of the underage Peter was practically not interested. Say, in the same batch of undergrowths with V.V. Golovin was a certain Mikhail Golitsyn, and he was also sent to "study to be a sailor." Golitsyn could not learn from him with all his desire, because he suffered from seasickness, but even this was not taken into account during the distribution.

In the same way, purely mechanically, young nobles were distributed during other reviews. Peter regularly held reviews of the undergrowth and just as regularly sent them to wherever he wanted, according to purely external signs, which had nothing to do with their desires, inclinations and interests.

So if you don't blame the sick on the healthy, then it wasn't the European mechanists who carried away the poor Peter with the ideas of a "regular state", but it was Peter who found in them what he had been looking for all his life, and came to a terrible delight.

Let me also remind you of Peter's amazing inability to understand the interlocutor, even just to be interested - what do people think, what do people feel? Peter not only did not know how to see and feel the inner world of other people. It seems that he did not really understand that other people can have their own inner life, that they have their own desires, THOUGHTS AND EMOTIONS.

Long before the break with his first wife, Evdokia, Peter personally tortured the accused of stealing state

money from her own uncle, Pyotr Avramovich Lopukhin. Whether Pyotr Avramovich was at least somehow to blame is still not

66

is known, but how this story affected the relationship of the spouses is understandable, I think, without comment.

What is this? Incredible infantilism? A symptom of mental illness? I can't explain because I'm not an expert. In any case, Peter lived completely outside of reality, and this was reflected not only in his relationship with people. One of his decrees "Report about the place of the fire half an hour before it starts!" what is it worth.

And if we return to relations with people ... All his life, since the tiny Petrusha Romanov squealed wildly and fought, demanding to be allowed to break a glass or a cup, and before the elderly tsar began to wheeze in his last torment, he was strikingly inadequate to the whole world in which he had the good fortune to be born, including his environment. Moreover, Peter turned out to be inadequate to any environment, any situation, any environment and any social stratum in which he found himself.

An amazing contrast to his father! Aleksei Mikhailovich managed to "fit in" everywhere, remaining completely tsar.

If Aleksei Mikhailovich had not been born a tsar, he could still have made a career, more or less. But it is difficult to imagine the fate of Peter without spiritual anguish, if he were not the son of a king, but be the son of even a rich and noble, but still not such a high-ranking person. Himself, by his own labors, he would never have been able to occupy such a high and even comparable position in society.

What has already been said is quite enough to come to the conclusion that the very possibility that such types as Peter can gain unlimited power looks like a merciless verdict on an unlimited monarchy.

But there are at least two more important parts of Peter's life about which not a word has yet been said.

FUNNY

Firstly, these are "fun troops!". Back in 1682, in Moscow, near the Kremlin Palace, a playground was made for the military games of 10-year-old Peter.

67

A child of this age enthusiastically commanded adults, several years older, guys given to him for entertainment. Military commands, shooting, rifle techniques - all this gives him serious pleasure, Peter is more and more drawn into the game.

With the expulsion of the Naryshkins to Preobrazhenskoye, the "amusing army" also moved there. The word "amusing" itself makes sense to clarify - the army is created indeed for the tsar's favor, but his weapon is not at all an "entertainer NOE". Divided into "warring armies", the amusing army fires at each other with not real bullets and cannonballs, of course. There are blank charges in the guns, and only a wad flies at the enemy (which, however, can hurt and burn). Cannons are loaded with steamed turnips or peas. Not a core or a grenade, but a red-hot sticky mass flies for several tens of meters, which may well get into the eyes or ears, knock down and concuss.

In 1685, a military camp was built on the Yauza, which Peter ordered to be called the "capital city of Presbur GOM" (or Preshburg). Since then, one "amusing army" takes the city, and the other fights back according to all the rules of martial art. How it was before that time, I don't know, but since this year, the "amusing troops" quite definitely appear dead.

"Funny" attack and the civilian population. They zealously, as befits military men, carry out orders when they are ordered to point cannons loaded with turnips at a merchant caravan or at a noble boyar with his retinue, who came to exhort Peter, to persuade him to stop the disgrace. This is not my invention! Several times, on the direct orders of Peter, the "amusing" ones attacked the subjects of the Romanov family and the future subjects of Peter himself. On those who, after a few years, will swear allegiance to him.

And later, having matured, he will throw his "amusing" army on the population of his own country - in 1687, and 1690, and 1694. At this point, Alexei Tolstoy writes the purest truth: when Fyodor Sommer became the "amusing" general, 16 real guns were brought from the Pushkar order and "they began to teach

68

the amusing people were taught to shoot iron bombs strictly: Fedor Sommer did not want to receive a salary for nothing. It was no longer fun. They beat a lot of different cattle in the fields and maimed the people. A perfectly fair description based on historical sources.

A surreal picture: soldiers in metal helmets on their heads and with guns at the ready, chasing the village herd, firing cannons at the peasants cleaning



harvest! Nevertheless, the picture is absolutely real, and there is no one to complain about material costs and even murders. After all, at the head of ugliness is the king himself!

Since 1686, adults have also been enrolled in the "amusing" ones, battalions have been formed from the "amusing" ones. In 1687, entire "amusing regiments" were created - Semenovskiy and Preobrazhenskiy. Peter is not the only king yet, but the "second" one - but he is already the commander-in-chief of a small army.

Some of the historians put Peter in great merit that he made longer maneuvers in the army, especially earnestly prepared and trained soldiers ... But these were not at all maneuvers in the strictly military sense of the word; it was rather about his favorite toy, with which Peter was unable to part.

Already after the coup of 1689, which made Peter a full-fledged king, and having crossed into his third decade, Peter continued to have fun in the same way. On June 2, 1690, his face was severely burned during the "amusing assault" on the Semenov court. On September 4 of the same year, an "exemplary" battle took place near Preobrazhenskiy: the best archery regiment, consisting of horse and foot archers, was supposed to fight against the Semenovskiy regiment and horse courtiers. On this day, they fought until complete darkness, there were many wounded and burned.

In October 1691, "a great and terrible battle took place at Generalissimo Friedrich Romodanovskiy, who had the capital city of Pressburg." On this day, the reytars of Captain Pyotr Alekseev were very distinguished, who, in the end, captured "the enemy Generalissim Sa Romodanovskiy." That the tsar was hiding under the name of Peter Alekseev is already clear to the reader.

69

In the words of Peter himself, "that day was equal to the day of judgment," and the tsar's neighbor, Prince Ivan Dmitrievich Dolgorukiy, "due to his grave wounds, moreover, by God's will, he moved to eternal shelter, according to the order of Adamov, where and all of us in time to be." How many more people moved there by birth and rank, smaller and worse, is unknown. Those about whom the king will not write and will not even recognize. It is only known that there were many wounded and killed.

In the autumn of 1694, the famous Kozhukhovskiy campaign was organized - the movement of two "enemy armies" under the village of Kozhukhovo, near the Simonov Monastery. These were the "Russian army" under the command of Fyodor Yurievich Romodanovskiy and the "Polish army" commanded by Ivan Ivanovich Buturlin. Many servicemen were mobilized into both armies, not paying much attention to their age, state of health, and even more so, their desire.

Romodanovsky, in the "Russian army", had the regiments of Semenovsky, Butyrsky and Preobrazhensky, eight ray tar companies, three companies of grenade men, two companies of subordinate people, called Nakhalov and Naletov, and 20 companies of such draws (that is, turned for "fun" courtiers). There were about 7,500 people in the "Polish army" - companies of archers and consisting of clerks and clerks, that is, from clerks, out of business and also driven to the "tech". In total, the number of participants in the "fun" is approaching 30 thousand.

The "Polish King" settled in a fortress - a military camp made in an open field, and Romodanovsky took it. Bombardier Pyotr Alekseev again, of course, performed glorious deeds - he captured the archery colonel. Having lost the fortress, the "Polish king" settled in a new fortified camp and "fought back fiercely and desperately" until Romo Danovsky forced him to surrender. In a word, the battle was long and cruel, almost "real", and this time we know that "24 people were killed with wads and other cases, and 50 were wounded," as Boris Kurakin reports.

It is also known that Peter was very pleased with the "fun.... and the opinion of the relatives and friends of those who died for the entertainment of the king, of course, was of no interest to anyone.

70

Simultaneously with the "fun" on land, there were also "fun" on the water: already in the spring of 1691, the tsar himself made and launched a yacht on the Moscow River, and in the autumn he left for Lake Pereyas. Lev Kirillovich Naryshkin and Boris Alexandrovich Golitsyn specially went for Peter - so that he personally received the Persian ambassador. On May 1, the first ship was launched at the Pereyaslav shipyard, and in July the entire court left for Pereyaslav and stayed there until September (after which Peter immediately began a new land "fun").

It turns out that Peter, already an adult, spent most of the year in "amusing troops" and in ship "fun" ... And an involuntary question arises: what is this ?! Is it really a protracted game of toy soldiers, where instead of tin figures real people participate and real blood flows? In the end, the "amusing army" waged real battles, in which there were wounded and killed ... And they are led, organized, first by a boy of 12, 15 years old, and soon a young man of 20, 22 years old ...

Or is it about some kind of manic love for the army? To its paraphernalia in the form of commands, weapons, orders, bandit songs, campaigns, corpses in roadside dust?!

Or Peter simply does not feel confident in the royal palace - he is not ready, not educated ... but he does not want to, finally! And in the army, especially in the self-created ar-

mission, he is comfortable, cozy... |

These assumptions, at least, make it possible to explain why it was the army in its "amusing" version that became Peter's game of many years and why this game disappeared with the start of constant campaigns. At first, after all, it was generally difficult to distinguish where the "amusing" campaign was, and where the real thing was. Let's say, on May 1, 1684, Peter sets out on HIS "second sea voyage" to Arkhangelsk. In terms of meaning, this is just a trip of the tsar to Arkhangelsk, to look at foreign ships, and nothing more. But Peter is moving with a part of his "amusing army", and, of course, with its command staff. Romodanovsky was appointed admiral scrap, the "Polish king" Buturlin - vice admiral, rear admiral - Gordon.

71

The smooth transition from the "amusing war" to the real war is very clearly visible on the example of the Azov campaigns - in | The Azov campaign in 1695 was still the real "amusing army". The local army and the Cossacks were sent to the lower reaches of the Dnieper to distract the Turks, led by their boyar Boris Sheremetev. And the Semenovskiy, Preobrazhensky, Lefortov regiments, the city archers and the Gordon regiment moved to Azov, to the lower reaches of the Don. We walked just as merrily and dashing as in "amusing campaigns." Peter wrote back to Apraksin: "We were joking near Kozhukhov, and now we are going to play near Azov"; and in another place: "for your health we drink vodka and Renskoe, and even more beer." Azov turned out to bear little resemblance to Preshburg, and the case near Azov turned out to be far from "amusing", absolutely from any point of view - but this is already a second question. The main thing is that Peter and near Azov went to have fun.

All Peter's wars directly follow from his "amusing" wars and campaigns and are intertwined with fun. Until the end of his days, he adored the army and very often was in it under the pseudonym "Peter Mikhailov", "Peter Alekseev", "captain-scorer" and so on. He never made a fundamental difference between a real active army and a "funny army".

Not a single person who wanted to have good relations with Peter could avoid participating in his wars, and in his youth - in "amusing wars". The exceptions, perhaps, are his own uncles, Natalya's brothers Kirilovna. But the terrible head of the Preobrazhensky order, Yuri Fedorovich Romodanovsky, and Franz Lefort, and Boris Golitsyn - all of them, like cute ones, commanded "amusing" armies.

Apparently, "amusing troops" is not only a place of entertainment, but also a kind of royal club - a place where he finds suitable people for himself, communicates with them informally, "without uniforms." Where reputations are created and hierarchies are built, plans are hatched.

and appointments are being prepared. But still this anonymity of the king himself is interesting! Is there something behind her?

And besides, Tsar Peter had one more club...

72

## ALL DRUNK CATHEDRAL

It was "The most eccentric, the most drunken, the most jocular Cathedral" - that was the official and full name of this institution. When it was founded, I can't say exactly, but in any case, long before the Naryshkins came to power. Even in our enlightened, incredibly progressive times, more than one eyebrow will be raised if a boy of 14 or 15 wants to start a company under that name.

The all-drunken cathedral was not just a gang... It was a long-term game with its own rules and laws. If the "amusing" battles imperceptibly grew into military campaigns and died out, then the All-Drunken Cathedral was preserved until the death of Tsar Peter.

In this club, Peter also had a modest rank - a deacon, and Nikita Zotov became its head - "The most noisy and most joking father Ioanikit, the Patriarch of Pressburg, Kokui and All Yauz", also called prince-pope.

The cathedral was a kind of "public organization" and even had its own charter. This statute was written personally by Peter, and the reader will not be mistaken in assuming that it was a very long and incredibly detailed document. The charter defines in detail the ranks of the Council and the methods for electing the "prince-pope" and ordination of all the ranks of the drunken hierarchy. Yes, ordinations! The cathedral fully reproduced the entire church hierarchy and all church ceremonies.

The main requirement of the charter was simple: "to be drunk all the days and never go to bed sober". Well, the requirement to obey the hierarchy of the cathedral - its 12 cardinals, bishops, archimandrites, priests, deacons, protodeacons. All of them bore nicknames "which will never, under any censorship charter, appear in the press"! There were also the most joking mother-bishops and the yoke of men. All vestments of all ranks, all prayers

Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 2. Rostov-on-Don, 2000. S. 495.

73

and chants, the whole order of "service to Bakhus and Ivashka Khmelnitsky" and "honest treatment of strong drinks" were prescribed in the most detailed way.

The foul things done by Peter and his associates are quite similar to everything that the members of the "Union of militant atheists" did in the 1920s. And they ran with skulls on sticks, and yelled obscenities in the church, and threw up on the altar, and ... However, descriptions of the wild blasphemy of All the most drunken cathedral can fill entire books, but is it worth it? It seems that everything is already clear.

'The sober, like terrible sinners, were solemnly excommunicated from all taverns in the state. Wise heretic fighters against drunkenness were anathematized.

In general, the cathedral was a frank and extremely blatant parody of the Church and its rites, and some of the rites of the cathedral are such that it is hard to believe. When a new member entered the cathedral, he was asked: "Are you drinking?" — just as in the ancient church the newcomer was asked, "Do you believe?"

When the newcomer answered: "I drink," he was seized by people dressed in clothes turned inside out, with masks of cats and pigs on their faces, or with physiognomies blackened with soot, and dragged him to a wine barrel.

Nikita Zotov, drunk, of course, in a snipe, sat on this barrel, with a "cross" made from two tobacco pipes, in the clothes of a monk, but with a slit in the back. In his other hand he held a raw egg instead of a

zhava.

- Bless, father!

He cursed wildly and "blessed" — waved the "cross", kicked with his foot and beat the "initiate" on the crown of the head with a raw chicken egg so that the broken egg would flow down his face. Other, so to speak, ordinary participants of the cathedral flew in. With meowing, screaming, neighing, stomping, screeching, they dragged a person - to solder him to the point of confusion, to vomiting.

It is characteristic that this disgrace was not always only for "internal use", in one's own circle. Not having time to enter at least some kind of force, immediately after the coup of Medvedikha, Peter began to show morals with all his might

74

The most drunken cathedral and even forced others to take part in it.

Already in 1690-1691, at Christmas time, members of the cathedral went to glorify Christ throughout Moscow. A company of 200 people on several dozen sledges harnessed

pigs, dogs, goats, bulls, went from house to house, from evening to morning. On the front sleigh is Peter's favorite teacher, Nikita Zotov (by the way, I did not put a single drop of irony in the word "beloved" - Peter really loved him very much), the "prince-dad" drunk to death, waving a staff and in a tin miter on the head. Behind him rode dressed in bast hats, in bast bags, in multi-colored caftans decorated with cat's paws and squirrel tails, in straw boots, and so on.

The company broke into houses and demanded wine and vodka everywhere, wandered around the house in search of food, drink and various kinds of "adventures": they tore off the skirts of the servants, and even the owner's daughters, drank everything they found. In general, they behaved according to the old army saying: "drink everything that burns, enter into intimate relations with everything,

that moves."

They also gave the owner a drink and, "having drunk to amazement", mocked him as they liked. In this part of his "Peter the Great", Alexei Tolstoy does not deviate from the truth, telling how the boyar Buinosov was put "with a naked goose in a basket with eggs", and "the prince ... they hammered a candle into the anus and sang irmoses around it (religious chants - A.B.). In a word, "the Christmas fun this year was so difficult that some prepared for it, as if for death".

Since everyone knew that Peter himself was among the "jokers", there were no resisters.

On the very first week of Great Lent, "His Jester's Procession" arranged a penitential procession: he rode out in a sleigh pulled by pigs or dogs, riding goats or bulls, in fur coats turned inside out. If at Christmas time it was supposed to bring them vodka and pay

Tolstoy A.N. Petr1.M.: Zakharov, 2004. S. 255. 75

for "glorification", now it was supposed to bring vodka for repenting, "for repentance".

If "amusing battles" imperceptibly disappeared from the life of the king, then the All-Joking Cathedral remained his favorite toy until the end of his life. And even outside the "sessions" of the cathedral, elements of this entertainment arose at every step.

At Maslenitsa in 1699, after a magnificent court dinner, in the presence and with the participation of hundreds of people, the tsar arranged not just anything, but a "service to Bacchus." "Prince-pa-pa" Nikita Zotov "blessed" the kneeling guests with pipes. Having blessed the latter, forcing everyone, including the ladies, to drink a large glass of vodka and having drunk himself, Zotov began to dance, brandishing the "shepherd SKIM" STAFF.

Only one of the guests present at the dinner, the French ambassador, could not stand this insanity and left, referring to the fact that there were no such All-Joking Councils in his country and he was not used to anyone.

In January 1694, the royal jester Yakov Turgenev was married to a "deacon's wife" (so in the sources)! I would like to believe that we are still talking about a deacon's widow, but, knowing Peter, I fully admit that they could have married a jester and a wife with a living husband.

They celebrated the wedding, crowning the Turgenevs twice - in a real church, and leading the young around a wine barrel at the cathedral, carrying utter obscenities and kicking themselves blue in the face. And they walked in processions around Moscow, followed a carriage of young people on goats, bulls, and pigs ... However, the reader already knows all this vile exoticism from Christmas "fun".

This wedding company also did not leave the Muscovites alone: Yakov Turgenev went to visit the merchants, and the tsar himself visited the boyars and service people.

Adult Peter, in his fourth and fifth decade, sometimes frolicked in exactly the same way. In the program for the celebration of the Peace of Nystadt in 1721 (Peter is 49 years old, he has only 4 years left to live), he included the most obscene wedding of the new "prince-dad", old Buturlin, with the widow of the former "prince-dad", deceased Nikita Zotov. In a solemnly clownish atmosphere of young obven

76

chali in the Trinity Cathedral, and the role of the gospel was played by a box of vodka, the format similar to a holy book, and the jesters rudely mimicked every word and every movement of the priest.

Foreigners sometimes came up with excuses for Peter's behavior that were simply remarkable in their naivety. Like, he wanted to show the Muscovites how unattractive drunkenness is, and at the same time he wanted to combine contempt for drunkenness and debauchery with disgust for the prejudices of Moscow Orthodoxy. Historians, closer to our time, found meaning in the tsar's outrages - after all, by the time of Peter, Orthodoxy had become stagnant in a purely formal approach to faith. It was necessary to show the people the abomination of this ossification, and for this the dirty parody of the All-Jokes' Cathedral served just as well...

I leave the reader to judge for himself whether it is easy in this way to cause disgust for something other than themselves for drunken boobies (and this is still a very mild definition). And to what extent the drunken Zotov going to dance or Buturlin falling every three steps are able to lead the ordinary Muscovite to thoughtful reflections on formalism in the Orthodox Church and to "desire" the

something more alive.

It has also been suggested that Peter used drunkenness as a way to loosen the tongues of those around him. Allegedly, he was very healthy, he got drunk slowly, and the rest of the drinking companions, having drunk, expressed everything that they had in their hearts. Perhaps Peter really used this method. About F.Yu. Romodanovsky knows this for sure - Fyodor Yuryevich invited guests to his place and got drunk "to the point of amazement" of the guests, in this way finding out their thoughts and their attitude to someone or another.

But, in the first place, Peter realized the benefits of this method of ascertaining the moods of his subjects very slowly, only many years after the Most Joyous Cathedral had not dried up for many years.

Secondly, what does it have to do with health?! The ability to drink a lot without getting drunk only indicates that the alcoholic's liver has already undergone the first changes. A healthy person is just the one

77

who gets drunk sharply and immediately, even from small doses of alcohol. In countries with a drinking tradition, from adolescence, a person is trained to "know how to drink" - and, alas, almost without exception, we are sick people to some extent. The one who invents "half a liter" and then dances with Zotov is no healthier than a drug addict who injects 100 lethal doses of heroin into his vein.

Peter is a very, very sick man. Among other things, he is a patient with alcoholism. In 1698, the English Bishop Beckett noted that Peter was trying to overcome his "passion for wine" - that is, dependence on alcohol. Such behavior is not typical for everyday drunkards who drink because it gives them pleasure. Efforts to break the humiliating addiction to alcohol are typical of those who feel they can no longer stop drinking, no matter how much they enjoy it. But if alcohol has already become part of the metabolism in the body, it is no longer a bad habit, but a disease, and, moreover, a serious illness that corrupts the personality of an alcoholic, and it is difficult to get rid of the disease.

Then ... then what is the meaning of the All-Jokes' Council? What is the significance of drunkenness throughout the Petrine era? Is it only in blasphemy, given that Peter knew and honored the church rite, sang church hymns in the choir with the choristers, could he lead the service himself, while understanding its meaning? One can, of course, recall the words of the Holy Scriptures on the account of the fact that "demons also believe and tremble." But many things get in the way, including the obviously ritualistic appearance of Peter's drunkenness. Why did he need this...



One of the explanations can be looked for in the fact that the All Joke Cathedral has developed as a "royal club" to an even greater extent than "amusing troops". Literally not one of the highest officials of the state escaped the common fate - another thing is that some, thirsting for ranks and significance, did not crawl out of the cathedral, while others did not go there often. But only one person from Peter's inner circle was not in the meetings of the All-Jokes' Council... But about this person - separately, and below.

78

At the court of Peter, drunkenness was generally considered something like a rule of good manners. Refusal to drink was considered almost as a state crime. According to Bishop Gilbert Burnet of Salisbury, even in England, Peter himself drove and purified vodka (the English bishop called it "brandy", but described the moonshine with enviable accuracy).

As for the assemblies, a phenomenon that seems to have nothing in common with the All-Drunken Cathedral...

The Braunschweig envoy Weber described in detail what was done at one such assembly. A certain civil official Bassevich was late for the start, and Peter forced him to drink four full glasses of Hungarian, and then drink with everyone "with diligence." Moreover, the volume of the glass was then about 400 grams, and the Hungarian was strong - about the same as modern port wine. Peter personally made sure that everyone drank, drank and drank... Noticing that glasses were put on the left side of the table, unfinished, he forced everyone to drink a "huge glass", and when he went upstairs to the empress, he placed sentries at the door, so no one can escape.

"The great admiral wept like a child... Prince Menshikov fell dead, and his people were forced to send for the princess and her sister, who, with the help of various alcohols, brought him to his senses and asked the tsar for permission to go home with him. The Wallachian Prince Kante Mir grappled with the Chief of Police; then some kind of quarrel began, then the clinking of glasses for brotherhood and eternal friendship was heard. If it were not for details, such as the guards at the door of the "banqueting hall", and not for the enumeration of the considerable social ranks of those present, the description would be quite like a description of the most vile drinking bout of vagabonds, parasites, and even a criminal element.

There are many such descriptions. The assemblies also made a strong impression on foreigners, as a result of which both the Swedish envoy Kinnigsek and the German in the Russian service Bergholz, who became the founder of the Russian noble family, wrote about them, and many, many others. The Russian nobility was very

79

knitted by his own, personal participation in all this ugliness, but the descriptions and assessments of both the competent commoner Dean Pososhkov and Prince Golitsyn are decisively in no way are different.

And the Old Believers so briefly and clearly called the assemblies "the devil's temple" and "the deed of the pagans .. And quite accurately on the rekli - because one gets the full impression of some kind of gloomy ritual, non-participation in which simply makes one doubt the loyalty of "fellow Peter" .

So, alcoholism is the most important of Peter's clubs. The club to which he remained faithful all his life. Not a single appointment to any significant position is known, not a single award made by Peter to a person who would not at all participate in the ritual of Peter's drunkenness.

A club is actually a place where like-minded people gather, and this is why a club is important for a monarch: it allows you to select people who meet some necessary qualities or carry some necessary ideas.

According to what parameters should the members of his main club become unanimous with the tsar?

By itself, drunkenness always indicates a person's rejection of the life in which he is forced to live. If there is no need to run away from reality, if you live interestingly and well with what you have, then there is absolutely no need to drink regularly. Now, if life is not in life, the wife is the last bitch, the children are idiots, the authorities are scum on the scum, and life without is reliably lost, then it makes sense to climb into the eatery, spread out on an overturned box, on a newspaper, pickled cucumber and fish, knock over a glass and another so that the clouds dance, the grasshopper squealed on the violin, the shabby faces of drinking companions would radiate radiance, their tongue-tied speeches would become receptacles of the world's mind, and the vile diner would generally turn into a wonderful place to visit more often

wat.

80

Of course, alcoholic escapism can have many shades - including political

cal. V. Vysotsky and other "legally dissidents" in the USSR in the 1960s-1980s drank with frankly dissident goals. The logic is clear: once you get drunk, but so famous, loved by the people, people drink -

means "no, guys, it's not like that, it's not like that, guys," in the state - that's what their drunkenness signaled.

Chinese "dissidents" who did not accept the official ideology - Confucianism - drank the same way. Ku Fu Tzu, Confucius, severely condemned drunkenness: a perfect husband cannot intoxicate himself! A perfect husband serves the state, leads society, reads books, comprehends life in order to become even more perfect! But the famous poet Tao Yuanming "did not fit" into the life prescribed for him, did not want to be a perfect husband. He did not serve the state, did not read Confucian books, lived in the village and wrote these verses:

After all, it happens! People live in the same house.

What to accept, what to discard, they do not agree on anything. Let's say a certain scientist is drunk every evening. Let's say a certain leader is sober every day. This sober and drunk make each other laugh; They cannot say a word to each other without laughing.

Within the framework of sobriety, a narrow person is hopelessly stupid, He approaches the sages in a lofty way.

The degradation of Soviet power in the USSR gave rise, it seems, to many of the same "approaching the wise men", only without the mind and talent of Tao Yuanming.

And Peter? All his drinking buddies in the cathedral? In essence, what did Peter ridicule, what did Peter sneer at in the All-Drunken Council? The Orthodox Church, of course! But it's not just her. Velichaya F.Yu. Romodanovsky as "King", "Sovereign", "Your Radiant Tsarist Majesty", and himself as "your everlasting slave and serf", "your serf RKeg", or even simply "Petrushka Alekseev", after all, Peter ridiculed and their own power. He made a mockery of the very state, which he himself devoutly served and which he forced all his subjects to serve.

81

And this makes one ask the question - why did the king break into drunken drunkenness? What did he run away from in a glass of sivukha? Why did he ridicule, made his own power and his own position in society the subject of buffoonery?

And here I venture to give an answer ... or rather, a variant of the answer that can cause different emotions in readers ... And who told you that Pyotr Alekseevich wanted to be tsar?! The question seems somehow even wild; especially after the reader passes a whole string of people capable of anything, including criminal

leniya, just to sit on the throne, or at least stand near it. But it does not follow from this that EVERY person, including anyone born into a royal family, certainly wants this.

Alexei Mikhailovich clearly liked being king. Pyotr Alekseevich, with the same certainty, did NOT like it. He did not want to meet the ambassadors of foreign states in the Chamber of Facets, to "sit" with the boyars, to make responsible decisions, to live in solemn splendor, which has the other side - taking responsibility for the whole country, for the fate of war and peace, for the present and future of Muscovy.

Without saying anything else, he was too unprepared for all this. Too wild and poorly educated to feel natural in the company of foreign ambassadors, too ignorant to make fateful decisions, too unprepared for the "role" of a ruler, a king, he naturally fled from reality, where only this role was assigned to him. He ran away to where his role as "Petrushka Alekseev", an ordinary "scorer", "protodeacon" or "skipper" corresponds to his level of competence, knowledge, and general culture. Maybe he wanted to be not a king, but an ordinary bombardier? Maybe that's why even in Germany and Holland he tried to copy not the way of life of the sovereign princes, but the sailors and junior officers, the middle strata of the bourgeoisie? Maybe that's why the gatherings of his courtiers are more like the feasts of artisans than the solemn gatherings of courtiers?

82

And the malicious ridicule of the grapes that turned out to be "green" to Peter created obscene parodies of the Church and the power structure. Perhaps, by the way, this is also why Peter's love for the representatives of ancient families, for people who are smart, competent and educated?

IS HE ROMANOV?

However, was Peter still the actual son of the king?

Yes, this is the question that contemporaries have already asked themselves. To some extent, this is a question from the same series as the question - is he the Antichrist?

"In Nemetchyna the tsar was changed!" - shouted in 1696 a certain clerk, and his cries found complete understanding among many "simple" people, and to some extent - among the boyars. Elder Alexander conveys the conviction of so many priests and peasants that Peter was born from an "unclean maiden"! Such rumors could very well just go

because the king was frankly "not like that", and their logic is very clear - since the king is "wrong", unrighteous, then he is a changeling!

But there were much more serious grounds for considering Peter "not a real" Romanov... At least the physical appearance of Peter. All the Romanovs, starting with the first Tsar Mikhail and his father Filaret, were, roughly speaking, small and fat. The children of Alexei Mikhailovich from Miloslavskaya also grew up as typical Romanovs - small, well-fed, psychologically stable, good-natured. You can, of course, say that Peter went to his relatives through his mother ... It seems that he became an adult like one of his mother's brothers, Fyodor Naryshkin. From the Naryshkins, some historians also derived his briskness, including the briskness of thought. After all, several wits of the 17th century came from the Naryshkins (but, to tell the truth, it is difficult to find wit in Peter).

Soloviev S.M. History of Russia since ancient times. Book U11. M., 1962. S. 102.

83

But the Naryshkins were neither tall nor especially strong.

So who, then, did the heavy neurotic Peter go to - a height of 2 meters 9 centimeters, who could roll a silver plate into a tube or cut a piece of cloth with a sharp knife on the fly?

It is interesting that, in fact, before Peter the Romanov family, there were never people "with deviations .... as the people say," with greetings. There were no times when the "thin" Romanovs sat "below" the Vorotynskys and Morozovs and did not even dream of any royal crown. They were different people, but, in any case, not below the average mental and psychological norm. People are like people.

It is generally accepted that the first tsar from the Romanov dynasty, Mikhail, was chosen just "for his age" and for his "quiet disposition": the boyars, who were accustomed to turning the fate of the country and the throne, considered that a quiet 17-year-old guy would never grow up to be a hindrance to them.

But Mikhail Fedorovich was far from stupid, and a well-educated young man, according to the concepts of that time, and he grew into a fairly independent tsar. To the extent of "advising", but to the extent of domineering, resolute, self-confident.

The high, clearly above average, intellectual qualities of Alexei Mikhailovich and his children from Miloslavskaya were spoken of by everyone who was familiar with this family. And further

one thing that the boyars did not make a mistake in choosing Mikhail Romanov to the throne - the Romanovs before Peter were a very calm, good-natured family. Nickname Quietest yes to Alexei Mikhailovich is not accidental. Yes, he was terribly afraid of conspiracies, witches and sorcerers. Yes, he sometimes dealt harshly with those who were shown as sorcerers or conspirators. Yes, he loved fairy tales, took omens seriously, and in general was fairly superstitious. With a hot hand, the tsar could punish the one who caused a "bad omen" - for example, he started on the water, when sailing in a boat, to say something about "we will drown .. Yes, he rotted boyar Morozova and her sisters in the Borovoye earthen prison ru, Princess Urusova (and not only these two, but many "persistent in schism").

84

But, in the first place, all this superstition, this rigidity in matters of religion, is very much in the spirit of the time. Sorcerers and witches were caught not only in Russia, and it is not at all Rus' that the palm belongs to the leadership in terms of caught and burned "servants of Satan". Against the background of the German inquisitors and even most of the German electors and dukes, Alexei Mikhailovich looks both a humanist and an intellectual. And we simply don't want to compare the passions for the schism and what the Catholics and Protestants in Germany, and vice versa, were doing.

Secondly, Alexei Mikhailovich fully deserved his nickname of the Quietest - both by his calm, sedate behavior, and the "meek" conduct of public affairs, and the complete absence of personal malice. Alexei Mikhailovich used to be tough, even cruel, and to a very large extent the son of his cruel, unkind century ... but one can confidently say about him: he was a kind person. A person who did not like to execute, punish, exile, inflict suffering. A man with a healthy zest for life, he loved good food, falconry, and intelligent conversation. He loved to give, feed, arrange feasts and weddings, delight with unexpected favors.

Under Aleksey Mikhailovich there was never a persecution of the innocent. The tsar more than once stopped the investigation if there were grounds to consider the person under investigation even guilty, but not very much so.

It is strange to think that Pyotr is the son of the intelligent, perceptive Alexei Mikhailovich, who knew how to understand people, who valued intelligent books and intelligent conversations... and, finally, who drank alcohol quite moderately. It is worthy of surprise that the not very commendable title of Antichrist was awarded to the son of the king, nicknamed the Quietest.

It is even more strange that Peter is the younger brother of the intellectual tsar Fyodor Alekseevich, one of the smartest and most educated tsars in the entire history of Rus'. Fedor, by the way, was also a "quiet" person. He was a man

rigid convictions, could insist on his own, did not bend if he considered something fundamental. But it is not at all accidental that all his reforms are not based on a ban on something, but almost exclusively on a clever permission or

85

allowing something that was previously forbidden or considered unnecessary.

By the way, the fool Tsar Ivan was also kind and "quiet", devoid of aggression and malice. Even in his stupidity, he was at least completely harmless to those around him.

Peter is so unlike his father and older brothers that there is no certainty at all that his origin is not from Alexei Mikhailovich, it may well be not just a palace tale, either invented by the Miloslavskys to spite Naryshkin, or gossip launched by envious people, to defame the young queen. They spoke too stubbornly about this, naming, moreover, various "real fathers" of Peter. Many of these stories are so similar to the truth that historians really begin to conduct anthropological teachings of Patriarch Joachim and Peter...

It remains to be assumed that there was no smoke without fire. Apparently, the behavior of Tsaritsa Natalya made it possible to make such assumptions. After all, neither about love amusements on the side of Maria Ilyinichna Miloslavskaya, nor assumptions about who could be the "side" father of Tsarevich Fedor or Princess Sophia, was never made. But if it was about some kind of secret ideological weapon of the Miloslavskys, then what, it would seem, prevented the Naryshkins from spreading reciprocal gossip - they say, all the princes born of Miloslavskaya are "not real"? Apparently, the reputations of the two wives of the king were very different.

Rumor called as the true father of Peter and Patriarch Joachim, and the groom Mishka Dobrov, and the bedkeeper Streshnev, and several of her relatives, the Naryshkins ... these latter, by the way, were especially stubborn.

Peter chose a rather original way to find out about his origins and very much in the spirit of his reign: he raised the alleged father on the rack and began to torture him with his own hands in order to "confess". He locked himself up for a long time, and then betrayed: a lot of us, they say, went to the "mother queen", and the devil knows whose son you are!

86

And who he was, this father or not a father, I will tell the reader a little later.

It is difficult to accept as objective evidentiary evidence what is said on the rack. It is logical to assume that under torture most often they do not tell the truth, but say what the torturers want to hear. If Peter heard what he expected... However, let the reader draw his own conclusions. My goal is to give the reader enough information to draw these conclusions.

However, there is another version, perhaps even more gloomy. The fact is that in the Russian Empire there were two noble families, whose representatives never rose to the ranks of generals. Such was the tradition - to dismiss at most the colonels, not to let the princes Kozlovsky and Naryshkin curry favor ...

The reason why the Kozlovsky princes were not supposed to be promoted is well known. Their curse has been going on since the time of Yuri Svyatoslavovich, Prince of Smolensk, who reigned at the turn of the 10th and 15th centuries. Yuri, Prince of Smolensk, during the war of 1401-1404 between the Muscovy of Vasily II and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Russian Vitovt, surrendered to Vasily II Smolensk!. It would seem that now Yuri Svyatoslavovich should be almost the most respected courtier of Vasily II ... And it would have been so, probably, if Prince Yuri had not resembled, according to all descriptions, the medieval Chikatilo or another sexual maniac with inclinations towards sadism, dismemberment of victims, and so on.

In 1403, he was inflamed with a passion for a beautiful young woman - Juliana Vyazemskaya. Juliana was an honest wife and did not intend to answer his harassment. Then Yuri Smolensky waylaid Juliana on a big man, with a small guard. He cut down all these guards with his retinue, and brutally raped the woman and then cut off her hands and feet, apparently as a punishment for her intransigence.

Essays on the history of the USSR. XIU-XV centuries. M., 1953. S. 247.  
87

After this terrible deed, Juliana lived for about two weeks and died, as you can understand, from blood poisoning. Now she has been canonized by the Moscow Patriarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church as a martyr.

Yuri Smolensky, Rurikovich by blood, after that he could not find a place for himself anywhere: neither in Muscovy, nor in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, nor in the Horde. No one wanted to see him anywhere, and the attitude towards him among the Orthodox, Catholics and Muslims was exactly the same - contempt and disgust. He lived for another twenty years, not accepted by anyone, in constant moving, and died



almost in a roadside ditch, on the border of three states. Perhaps, in the news of his death there is a certain shade of edification, and the chronicler somehow retouched the story ... let's say, he made the place of Yuri's death especially instructive.

Yuri's wife and children, even during his lifetime, threw themselves at the feet of Vasily II, the Grand Duke of Moscow: we are not to blame for anything! We ourselves curse the scoundrel, but we did not live much better than Juliana ...

Okay, Vasily took them to the service. But he gave the surname of the princes Kozlovsky (from the word "goat", which at that time was used in the same offensive sense as it is now!). The Grand Duke allotted the Kozlovsky princes the worst lands in the Kostroma district and ordered them to serve in the most difficult places, in military service, and at the same time to serve without reward, without promotion to high ranks, even for the brightest feats.

A late descendant of Yuri was Fedor Alekseevich Kozlovsky, who died at the age of 23 near Chesma: he jumped first on board the enemy flagship, dragging sailors and soldiers with him, grappled with three or four Turks on sabers at once, and they hacked the prince to death with scimitars.

A volume of poems remained from him... Experts, looking at these poems, assert quite seriously that the second Pushkin, the creator of the Russian literary language, perished near Chesma...

Even then they told him - do not get into a fight, the hour is not even, and your fate is literature. But Fedor Alekseevich

88

made it his duty to atone for the crime of the ancestor and rush into battle first ...

Pyotr Borisovich Kozlovsky, Fyodor Alekseevich's own nephew, did not serve in the army, because one leg was shorter than the other. He was a diplomat and during the Napoleonic wars he served as a resident of the Russian Empire in the Kingdom of Naples. He served with Alexander Zakharovich Chernyshov, a famous intelligence officer of that time, a Russian resident. What helped Chernyshov is not very difficult to guess.

And he was also a friend of Vyazemsky and Pushkin. With Vyazemsky, a distant descendant of Juliana, perhaps he also wanted to make friends in order to atone for that long-standing family sin. And this talented person was the founder of Russian popular science literature. In Pushkin's "Sovremennik" it was Pyotr Borisovich who wrote about steam locomotives, steamships, engines... In general, he developed the line of literature that was "held" by the magazine "Gekhnika-molodesti" under the Soviet regime. |

But this is all about the Kozlovskys, about whom it is known why a tradition has been established not to raise them to the rank of general. And who, fortunately for them, survived to the time when the ranks of generals are not really needed for happiness in life.

And why the Naryshkins were not made generals in the same way - this is a great secret, which, besides the Naryshkins themselves, was known, probably, by several ... well, maybe several dozen people. There are, after all, things that are not written down, but are passed down orally, from generation to generation. IN. Klyuchevsky is right - under no censorship regulations will they publish the nicknames of the members of the All-Drunken Council. But every historian nevertheless knows these nicknames! Because along with the transmission of information through texts, another tradition works: the oral one. Perhaps there was also a tradition of handing over to those who should know: why can't Naryshkins be promoted to the ranks of generals?!

The fact is that not one of the Naryshkins left the service in the ranks of generals. Even the one who guarded the Winter Palace under Elizabeth ... And he

89

retired with the rank of lieutenant colonel. Everyone knew the Naryshkins, they were famous as merry fellows, jokers and intemperate in drinking and in women ... But you might think they were the only ones like that! And not one of the Naryshkins, until their lineage was interrupted, rose in the service above a lieutenant colonel, and this looks like an unspoken ban on giving them high ranks. There is only one analogy - in exactly the same position was the family of the princes Kozlovsky.

Historians of the past are very restrained in describing THIS "terrible secret of the Naryshkins", and you yourself have to guess the reasons for stubbornly adhering to them in the service. There is a version that was circulating orally among scientists as early as the 20th century... According to this version, immediately after Natalya Kirillovna Naryshkina was taken to court, the entire populous, including dozens of people, the Naryshkin clan so greedily rushed to positions, honors and feedings and showed so little at that time. the same time of good service and human qualities, that their plundering of the treasury became this "secret of the Naryshkins."

I will say right away - the Naryshkins really went down in history as thieves, completely unspeakable and who are people who are low in their spiritual qualities. And the All-Drunken Cathedral met in the Naryshkins' house. And whether they were characterized in the range from "a fool, but harmless and kind" (this is about Lev Kirillovich) to "the husband is old, drunk and stupid" - about Matvey Naryshkin, Lev's second cousin. And Ivan Kirillovich Naryshkin, the younger brother of Natalya Kirillovna, became a boyar at the age of 22,

and besides, he behaved especially indecently - he always visited

drunk from early morning, arrogant and vicious.

Perhaps this behavior especially angered contemporaries due to the Naryshkins' artifice: according to the memoirs of Patrick Gordon (also a terrible drunkard), Kirill Poluektovich Naryshkin was not only a "Smolensk captain", but in the past also a "shooter's head from Tarusa" - that is, he came from service people according to the device, and not "according to the fatherland." Not a noble, but a serving nobleman.

90

But whether this is enough to remember the dirty deeds even in a hundred years, I'm not sure. You would think the others were so much better!

I won't guess whether there was such a dark secret in the history of the Naryshkin family as that of the Kozlovskys. But there is information, albeit deaf, about their tendency to closely related ties ... The Orthodox Church considered relatives up to the 7th knee too close for marriage, but the Naryshkins, according to rumors, circumvented these church strictness several times.

But among all the other lovers, Natalya Kiril was also credited with a cousin, Pyotr Fomich Naryshkin! And there was such a rumor that in fact the father of Pyotr Fomich was not Foma Poluektovich Naryshkin, but his brother and father of Natalia, Kirill Poluekto

vich Naryshkin. Then it turns out, Peter | - the son of a half-brother and sister, but the Romanovs do not have a single drop of blood in him.

They attributed Natalya and Fyodor's brother ... This last is absolutely incredible, because Fyodor was 8 years old when Peter was born ... But it was him that Peter raised on the rack, demanded to confess who his father was! Apparently, he assumed that if Fyodor was not his real father, then he should know the actual father ... Maybe just because Fyodor remained the only one of this generation who retained at least some kind of memory? After all, both sons of Foma Poluektovich, both Peter and Kondrat, died in 1682 - on May 15 they were literally torn apart by archers ...

I will not insist on the fidelity of all these rumors - now it is impossible to verify them, and the only way to establish the truth is to fly in a "time machine" in the 16th century and do DNA analysis for all participants in the events ... But the assumption that Peter was actually

the son of his mother's own brother explains a lot. And his incredible resemblance to the Naryshkins, with the complete absence of the features of the Romanovs. And his ... let's say streamlined - his oddities.

So, there are two more versions.

91

1. Peter is the fruit and victim of consanguineous interbreeding, the illegitimate relationship of brother and sister.

2. Peter is a victim of hereditary burden, a dark secret that was in the Naryshkin family - about the same as in the Kozlovsky family ...

It was this "secret", the vicious inclinations of the ancestor, that emerged from Peter ...

Perhaps, tired of all the horrors of this chapter, the reader will involuntarily think: maybe all this is not very scary? Well, think about it, not a very sane king! Well, not the king's, but the devil, whose son! Do not cling to personal life, including royal; also to me, moralists were found ...

Some reader will even say: maybe Peter's personal qualities are for the best? Maybe it's just as well that a tsar came to power - a maniac of transformations? Maybe it was impossible to do it any other way, but it was necessary only in this way: with violence, with a whip, with cruelty! Let him ruin it, let him frighten him, but he did so much!

The position is not particularly ethical, but quite understandable, and the prevalence of this position makes us look carefully - what did Peter do after all?

Chapter 3

WHAT DID PETER REFORM?

- ... In the dominance ... of the boyar feast, a formidable knock broke in then, with which Peter cut the window to Europe.

- And cut through?

- Broke it!

- Did you break the door?

- No!

- So they climbed out the window like that?

- Who?

— Petrovtsy...

From "Alice in Wonderland"

## ARMY REFORM

The first thing to talk about is the reform of the army. The army is generally Peter's favorite child; a monster whose maintenance, according to official figures, took half the budget in 1701, three-quarters in 1710, and two-thirds in 1724. The first thing Peter encountered in public affairs was the army. Strictly speaking, Peter dealt with the army long before he took up state affairs. In 1690 or 1691, mother would not have let Peter come close to the levers of government, but by that time Peter had considerable experience in managing "amusing", and in 1695 and 1696 he already participated in a completely serious, real war - in assaults and in the capture of Azov.

Well, what new realities did Peter create in the army?

93

Allegedly, Peter created a regular army in Muscovy. But this is completely untrue. The creation of a regular army in Muscovy began in the Time of Troubles and was completed in 1679-1681.

In 1621, just 8 years after the accession to the throne of Mikhail Fedorovich, Anisim Mikhailov, son of Radishevsky, clerk of the Pushkar order, wrote the "Charter of military, cannon and other matters related to military science" - the first military charter in Muscovy. The "Ustav..." by Anisim Radishevsky began to be written as early as 1607; it generalized the experience of the Time of Troubles and contained translations of many foreign books.

The "Military Book" of Leonard Fronsperger, two parts of which were published in 1552 and 1573, Radishevsky quotes even too extensively, at the level of plagiarism.

On the basis of almost 663 articles of the new Charter, the regular Muscovite army of the Romanov era began to form. Half a century before the birth of Peter.

According to the Charter, the archery troops and the noble militia were retained in the army, but in parallel with them, "regiments of a foreign system" were introduced: soldiers, that is, infantry; dragoon - that is, horse; reitarskie - that is, mixed. And in general, according to this Charter, there are ranks of "vodsky", and there are "generals". A well-ordered hierarchy of lieutenants, captains, "maeors", colonels, crowned with generals, helps to manage the troops and psychological

logically facilitates rapprochement with Europe. I will also note that BOTH the WORD "COLONEL" AND THE WORD "lieutenant" are Russian in origin. Even earlier, independent commanders of separate units - regiments, were subordinate to governors, and orders were carried out by lieutenants who had not yet grown up to independent command.

The new Charter determined who they were, colonels and lieutenants, and what place they occupied in the hierarchy, and used foreign words only when it was difficult to do without them. The military hierarchy "in the regiments of foreign

1Beskrovny L.G. Reader on Russian military history. M., 1947.

94

earthly system" could not be limited to two ranks - well, they introduced two more "foreign" ones - I mean "maeo ra" and captain.

In 1630, the army consisted of the following groups of troops:

Noble cavalry - 27 433

Streltsy — 28,130 Cossacks  
— 11,192

Pushkars - 4136 Tatars -  
10208 Volga peoples -  
8493 Foreigners - 2783

Total 92,500 people

As you can see, the composition of the army is traditional irregular troops, except for hired foreigners. The government, preparing for the war for Smolensk, intends to change this tradition, and in April 1630 an order was sent to all counties on the recruitment of landless nobles and boyar children into the soldiery service, and then everyone who wanted to.

This gave an excellent result, and soon 6 regiments of soldiers were created - 1600 privates and 176 commanders each. The regiment was divided into 8 companies. Middle Komso becoming:

1. Colonel

2. Lieutenant colonel (great regimental lieutenant)

3. Maeor (watchman or roundabout)

4. 5 captains

In each company were:

. lieutenant

. Ensign

. 3 sergeants (Pentecostals)

. Quartermaster (rounder)

. Kaptenarmus (watchman under the gun). 6  
corporals (esauls)

. healer

. clerk

. 2 interpreters

10. 3 drummers

11. 120 musketeers and 80 spearmen

<000000000

95

I would like to note once again that the new names of the ranks are duplicated by the usual, old Moscow ones, probably in order to make them more familiar, to accustom people to new words. But, I believe, there is another reason - the Russian language is no worse than any other suitable for military commands or military ranks. It is only necessary that the old, familiar, but indefinite titles (esaul, roundabout, and so on) be used in a new sense and in the same meaning, determined by the Charter and the orders of the tsar and the Duma.

In December 1632, there was already a Reiter regiment of 2000 people, in which there were 12 companies of 176 people each under the command of captains, and there was a dragoon company of 400 people.

By 1682, when Peter was 4 years old, the formation of regiments of a foreign system as the basis of the Russian army was completed.

Peter allegedly destroyed a completely medieval noble militia and useless archers.

But the noble militia has not been medieval for a long time, since 1676. True, Peter began to disband the Streltsy troops after the Azov campaigns, but after Narva, having convinced himself of the qualities of the Streltsy troops,

interrupted disbandment. Streltsy participated in the Northern War and in the Prut campaign of 1711. Until the 1720s, according to the expression of an authoritative reference book, "the gradual absorption of the archers by the regular troops" took place.

But this is part of the regular central army. And until the end of the XVIIIth century, service people of the old services survive, and among them are the city archers. As they carried the police service, they carried the entire 15th century for themselves.

Some, at first glance, quite educated people are seriously convinced that Peter invented the baguinet bayonet and firing plutongs. I can explain this conviction in only one way - every innovation in Russia and throughout the world that occurred during the Petrine era is immediately attributed to Peter.

Shooting with plutongues was invented in 1707 by the Marquis Sebastian le Pierre Vaux Ban, Marshal of France, famous

96

Marshal Louis XU. This great commander, who is one of the foremost military heroes of all Europe, along with Eugene of Savoy and the Duke of Marlborough, invented a lot!

Previously, one rank came forward, fired, and went away. The second rank was advancing... Now one rank lay down on the ground, the second knelt down, and the third fired while standing. The intensity of the fire attack increased sharply, and such shooting began to be adopted by all armies. And the army of Muscovy - too.

Baguinet would be more correct to call bayonet. The word is French, because it was invented in the city of Bayon, in the French Pyrenees. Local residents, professional smugglers, needed protection from the French and Spanish border guards... Well, they came up with a bayonet, which, after a shot, can be inserted into the barrel of a gun. Considering that several minutes elapsed between shots, the advantage was clearly in someone who could almost instantly turn his gun into a spear ...

Bayonet was adopted by the French army under Marshal Vau Ban (1701-1717), during the War of the Spanish Succession, and due to this it won several victories.

Peter did use a bayonet under the Russian pseudonym baginet, and the only reform of the army that he actually carried out is connected with this. I have always wondered why the supporters of Peter and his reforms do not use this example. Indeed, after the terrible defeat of the Russian army by the Swedes in Grodno in 1706 (more catastrophic than near Narva!)



Peter, indeed, reformed the army.

Then, in January 1706, Karl KhPI, having lost 3,000 soldiers frostbitten and ill, surrounded and blocked the Muscovite army in Grodno with a sudden throw. It was only in the spring that they managed to withdraw the army from under complete defeat, taking advantage of the ice drift and throwing more than a hundred guns into the river. Because of the ice drift, Karl could not cross to the other side of the Dvina and pursue the fleeing Muscovites.

97

Until that time, the army created by Fedor Alekseevich and his generals in 1679-1681 fought. The Preobrazhensky and Semenovskiy regiments were formed according to all the rules of this army: the same uniforms, the same metal helmets, the same 20 or 30% of the available staff - spearmen, without firearms.

Now Peter, firstly, completely removed the kopeish kov, replacing them all with musketeers - the introduction of the bayonet-baguinet helped him in this. And he introduced soft cocked hats instead of helmets, green uniforms, which the guards were proud of even under Catherine: they say, our uniform was introduced by Peter the Great!

Some military historians of the last century, including such strong specialists as P.V. Volobuev and L.G. Bloodless, it is believed, it is true that Peter did not act independently here either. In all European armies of that time, the helmet disappeared as a completely unnecessary part that did not protect against bullets and buckshot, baguette was introduced everywhere. Peter only once again chatted with Europe, not really understanding even what exactly and why he was doing this.

Even if so, we still have a case in which Peter's military reforms exist not only in the writings of historians, but also in reality. Only now, I'm afraid, there were no more achievements along this path, and Peter never carried out any other reforms of the army.

Not only did the rule of the Naryshkins turn out to be like a steamroller for the army: the nobles who supported the Naryshkins strove for "indulgences" and, according to Prince Ya.F. Dolgorukov, "unreasonable, everything established by the former tsars was ruined." Peter, if he wanted to fight, had to start a lot from the beginning... And accustom the local cavalry to the order introduced in 1681, and create new "foreign regiments".

That is, it was possible, of course, to call on those who had already served in such regiments. After all, even earlier, dissolving the army home after wars, in the event of new wars, the kings called the already trained soldiers and placed under the command of old, experienced commanders.

98

Peter took a different path - in 1698-1699 he began to enroll freed serfs, peasants and even serfs into the regiments without the consent of their owners. Such an army, in the words of the Austrian Korb, was "a rabble of the worst soldiers recruited from the poorest rabble." In the more good-natured words of the Brunswick envoy Weber, "the most woeful people."

"In the same way, the first army of Peter the Great in the Northern War was composed: 29 new regiments from freemen and slaves of 1000 people each were fastened to 4 old regiments, 2 guards and 2 personnel. Narva discovered their combat quality.

True, the "Second Army of Peter" was not recruited from the best people. The selection and training of the "best" takes time, and recruiting sets in just 10 years of war siphoned off about 300,000 recruits from a population of 14 million. If in 1701 the complex of the regular army was 40 thousand people, then in 1708 - 113 thousand people.

By the end of Peter's reign, there were already between 196,000 and 212,000 regular troops in the Russian Empire, and 110,000 Cossacks and foreigners who fought "in their own formation" - Bashkirs, Tatars and the peoples of the Volga region. This horde of armed men was commanded by the General Staff in 1712—two field marshals, Menshikov and Sheremetev, and 31 generals, of which only 14 were foreigners.

Huge recruiting kits were needed not only to replenish the troops, but also to cover the colossal losses that Peter's army suffered even in peacetime - from hunger and cold.

Weber believed that for every one who died in battle, two or three died from cold and hunger, sometimes even at assembly points. Because, having captured a recruit, they put shackles on him and made a cross-shaped tattoo on his right hand; in fairness, under Peter they didn't think of numbers tattooed on prominent parts of the body, but they did come up with branding their subjects like cattle.

Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 2. Rostov-on-Don, 2000. S. 519.

99

And they kept the recruits "... in great crowding, in prisons and prisons, for a considerable time, and, thus exhausting them on the spot, they sent, without reasoning, according to the number of people and

the distance of the journey with one and then a worthless officer or nobleman, with insufficient food; besides, they will lead, having missed a convenient time, a cruel mudslide, from which many illnesses happen on the road, and they die untimely, while others flee and stick to thieves' companies - neither peasants nor soldiers, but they become the ruins of the state. Others would like to go to the service with pleasure, but, seeing at first such a disorder over their brethren, they come to great fear.

This is not a quotation from the writings of Old Believers or disgraced nobles; this is from the report of the Military Collegium to the Senate in 1719. The report was required after in 1718 there were 45,000 "unselected recruits" in the army and 20,000 on the run.

So the army under Peter became, according to Klyuchevsky, "more smutty" and a scarecrow even for those who initially wanted to serve in it.

However, recruits under Peter were called "immortal", because if a recruit died at a collection point, his village or township was obliged to supply another, exactly the same ... and the state did not lose anything by getting the "cog" it needed.

None of the officers trained in the army of Fyodor Alekseevich became a general under Peter. Drunkards from the All-Jokes' Council became generals, completely regardless of their talents and personal qualities.

We have to admit that in relation to the army, Peter played the role of a steamroller. Rather, his actions should be called not so much "reform" as "breaking", "destruction" or "explosion" - this will be significantly

more precisely.

## MILITARY. VICTORIES

The only military merit of Peter (or, rather, Sheremetev) was the conquest of the Baltic. A glorious deed that Alexey would not mind doing.

100

Mikhailovich, and Fedor Alekseevich, and General Fedor Alekseevich Grigory Grigorievich Romodanovsky, and very many others.

But even here their most serious "BUT" immediately appear ...

Firstly, Sweden by that time was clearly moving towards

decline. The country overstrained itself in the wars with Poland. The terrible "Flood", when in 1648 almost the entire territory of Poland was conquered and occupied by Sweden, cost dearly not only to the Poles. Charles XI with his cult of war was supported mainly by young army officers who craved glory and military honors. The war that Charles waged stubbornly was called the "war of honor" in Europe. That is, it was a war that is generally not needed for anything, but which is not possible to refuse without calling into question one's personal courage. On the jerky noblemen who did not have to earn a living, this worked. But the rude, down-to-earth burghers and older nobles (in whose hands material values were usually concentrated) who sat in the parliament-landtag regularly denied the king appropriations for the war. These boring types without famous ancestors, coats of arms and grandfather's swords did not understand how wonderful and honorable it was to fight. They all talked about their dreary taxes, the budget, and other dullness, from which the king's cheekbones yawned. But the money was in their hands, and no matter how the king resisted, they all "twisted the tap" - they gave less and less money for the war that ruined and exhausted Sweden, which she absolutely did not need.

Swedish fortresses in the Baltic States were dilapidated. Charles did not give them any help, bogged down in a more prestigious war with the Saxon Elector Augustus, King of Poland and an ally of Muscovy. Peter, in the war in the Baltic states, returned to the primitive means of intimidation from the time of Ivan 1, who threw primitive Tatars and Bashkirs at the Germans in the Livonian War. "Sheremetev crossed over the Narova, went to visit Estonia in the same way as he visited last year in Livonia. Would the guests be the same: Cossacks, Tatars, Kalmyks, Bashkirs, and guests

101

Is it still... Sheremetev entered Veshchenberg, famous in ancient Russian history, the city of Rakovor (modern Rakvere. - A.B.), and heaps of ashes remained in the place of the beautiful city. The same fate befell Weissenstein, Fellin, Ober-Palen, Ruin; the devastation of Livonia was also completed. At the end of September, Boris Petrovich returned home from the guests: cattle and horses ... were taken twice as much as last year, but less chu hon, because it was difficult to lead.

As follows from the text, the "chukhon" (Estonians) were simply cut by savages. If this is some kind of slander against the glorious army of Peter, I will be glad to hear another explanation for this "it was difficult to lead, therefore they brought less".

I will allow myself not to join the fervent tone of S.M. Solovyov and not consider the scorched earth tactics a great achievement of the Russian army. The deeds of the ancestors

to be proud of. Let me also remind you of the terrible massacre in all the cities taken by the Muscovites: Mariengo fe-Aluksen, where the famous pastor Gluck was taken, and among his servants the future Empress Catherine, in Narva and Oreshka, in Nyenschanz and Izhora.

The Swedes, who had such an opportunity, went to Sweden, home, and the local Russians and Germans quite easily swore allegiance to the Muscovites, the Swedish army had no mass support here.

Karl himself was not in Sweden for 15 years, he fought all the time in Germany and Poland. His war in 1708-1709 against Muscovy, when he simultaneously tried to set Mazepa's Ukrainians, Tatars and the Turkish Sultan against Moscow, is cited by military historians as the most typical example of disregard for the basic rules of military art. Karl constantly advanced with insufficient forces, without providing communications; he underestimated the enemy; he had poor intelligence; no preliminary battle plan was drawn up. Karl allowed himself the most fantastic calculations on the allies, who did not seriously think of helping.

1 Massey R. Peter the Great. T. 1-3. Smolensk, 1996. S. 8. 102

These "punctures" of Karl are not denied even by those Swedish historians who, in fact, are willing to talk about other qualities of this commander: the swiftness of his transitions, the ability to crush a superior enemy, suddenness and speed of action, exceptional personal courage.

Only 16,000 extremely exhausted Swedish soldiers took part in the Battle of Poltava (the advance detachment, in fact) with 2 guns. And against them stood 10 thousand fresh Russian soldiers with 72 (according to some sources) or 112 (according to others) guns.

The battle of Poltava lasted, by the way, only two hours... So huge was the superiority of the Russian army, and especially the artillery, which mowed down the Swedes as they pleased.

It remains to join V.O. Klyuchevsky with his harsh but true assessment: "It was a shame to lose Poltava ... emaciated, shabby, demoralized Swedes who were dragged here by a 27-year-old Scandinavian tramp"?

True, even here Peter was in his role: during the advance of Charles XI in 1708, he was so frightened that he ordered the treasures of the Kremlin to be taken out of Moscow and began to build a system of fortifications along the periphery of the country. He could not create many fortresses at once (and no one could). But Peter found a way out, and also very in his own spirit: in order to create fortifications, they began to cover the existing churches with earth.

An earthen mound was formed, inside of which there was a building from which it was possible to fire. Even at the beginning of the 20th century, two such hills were preserved in Pskov, on which children played.

And one more decision in the usual spirit of Peter - the introduction of a kind of "protective detachments" - if the Moscow troops began to retreat, those standing in the rear were to shoot at them. Recall that the ratio

'Tarle E.V. Northern War and the Swedish invasion of Russia. M., 1958.

2 Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 2. Rostov-on-Don, 2000. S. 511.

103

those who participated in the battle and stood in reserve amounted to 10 thousand to 30 thousand.

N-yes..

Having suffered a defeat in the Ukraine, Karl fled to Turkey, trying to organize simultaneous military operations from the north, the Swedish Army, and from the south, the Turkish. Only the organization of something was given to him much worse than swift attacks and raids. It was possible to rely on the intrigues of the Austrians and the French, to provoke Turkey to declare war in 1710.

However, the Prut campaign of 1711 was and remains a monument to the peculiar logic of not Charles, but precisely Peter. This is also an event in the very spirit of it. Although Turkey declared war, military operations did not begin, and Peter made the decision. Apparently, the Northern War could well have ended just in 1710-1711 - Sweden was very tired, the Riksdag does not want to fight, the king does not know where ... A decisive blow to Sweden itself, Muscovite ships on the Uppsala roadstead, a raid on Stockholm, lying vulnerable by the sea; Tatars and Bashkirs, howling, galloping along the coast, through towns with tiled roofs numb with fear, now Protect In the boil of apple orchards ..

In 1719 and 1720, it was worth carrying out two devastating campaigns in Sweden itself, and the Treaty of Nishtad immediately became possible, securing for Muscovy everything it had conquered.

But Peter decided otherwise. The Orthodox subjects of the Turkish Sultan - the Wallachians, Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbs, Romanians - all the time called Peter to fight with the High Port, to free them from the Muslim yoke. In their descriptions, it turned out that the terrain in Moldova is smooth, with water

and there can be no problems with food, the Turks are weak and are themselves terribly afraid of Peter. And as soon as Peter crosses the border with the army, all the peoples conquered by the Turks will immediately rise up.

Peter wrote to Sheremetev: "The lords write that as soon as our troops enter their lands, they will immediately unite with them and awaken all their numerous people to an uprising against the Turks: what are they looking at and fighting?"

104

(from whom we have the same request and promise), also the Bulgarians and other Christian peoples will rise up against the Turks, and some will join our troops, others will revolt inside the Turkish regions; in such circumstances, the vizier will not dare to cross the Danube, most of his troops will scatter, and maybe they will raise a riot.

Who do you have to be to get involved in such an adventure without having serious intelligence, without knowing all the circumstances?! It seems that Karl XI had just acted in the same way, having gone with small forces to Ukraine and Muscovy ...

In any case, Peter believed, and in June 1711 the Muscovite army entered Moldavia. Of course, he immediately discovered the saddest things: that the area was unfamiliar and unusual, in June it was already very hot, and there was little water. That the ruler Cantemir with 5,000 armed men is the only help of the Orthodox, and the Turkish army does not even think of running away or rebelling.

The army of the great vizier Bataldzhi Pasha (118 thousand soldiers, 440 guns) quickly connected with the 70 thousandth army of the Crimean Khan Devlet Giray. These powerful forces quickly deprived the Russian army of the strategic initiative and any opportunity to attack. All attempts to attack and generally advance the Turkish army extinguished. It was possible to lock oneself in a fortified camp (the experience was from the time of Preshburg). Muscovites successfully repelled attempts to take this camp, losing 3,000 of their own and killing 8,000 Turkish soldiers.

But even sitting in a besieged camp was not such a fun activity - there was no water, there was not enough food and ammunition. On July 9 the Muscovite army was blocked by the Turks, and on July 12 the Muscovites had already signed a peace treaty...

Because Peter was so frightened that he sent Peter Shafirov to the camp of the Turks with the order: to get peace at any cost. Anyone ... Even at the cost of abandoning the entire Baltic, except for St. Petersburg, and if this is not enough - give the Swedes and Pskov. A note by Peter Sha-

105

firov: "Staf with them on the fse, except for shklastvo (that is, except for slavery. - A. B.)" '.

It was then that the Turks and Swedes had a full opportunity to really put an end to Muscovy, to drive it away from the Baltic coast for a long time ... but only the Turks did not want to make such a luxurious gift to Karl. Karl begged the vizier to give him 30 thousand soldiers, and by evening he would bring Tsar Peter to the vizier with a rope around his neck ... This possibility cannot be ruled out, but the Turks pursued their goals, and only their own. In addition, it was much more pleasant for the vizier to put rich gifts from the Muscovites in his pocket than to give Karl an army.

According to the Prut peace treaty, the Turks released Peter and his army, and with him the allied Moldavians, led by Cantemir. And for this, Muscovy tore down all its fortresses on the Black Sea, including such large ones as Taganrog and Kamenny Zaton, gave Azov to Turkey, pledged not to interfere in the affairs of Poland and not to keep a fleet on the Black Sea, and ships built under Voronezh and such labor brought out of the Don, burn. In addition, Muscovy lost the right to keep its permanent embassy in Istanbul - an unheard of humiliation! Later, in 1713, another demand was added - to retreat from the Right-Bank (Western) Ukraine.

In general, the question arises - if Peter signed SUCH peace, what prevented the Turks from not letting him out of the mousetrap? Crush the blockaded army, bring Peter with a rope around his neck to Istanbul, and there he will sign such a thing ... But the fact of the matter is that the Turkish army, after the assault, in which almost three Turkish soldiers lay down for the life of one Muscovite, did not eager to continue the war well. Baltaci Mehmet Pasha signed an agreement that was extremely beneficial to his country, not wanting to destroy his people. The logic is well understood by a civilized person.

In the Prut campaign, 27,285 people died; of these, only 4,800 are in combat. The rest fell victim to disease, thirst and hunger. And besides,

War with Turkey 1711 Prut operation // Sat. documents ed. Myshlaevsky A.Z., St. Petersburg, 1898.

106

in the Prut campaign, all the achievements paid for with the blood of tens of thousands of people were buried - on the exit of Muscovy to the Black Sea.

We agree with the assessment of Peter's actions: "... he had no



happiness, instead of concentrating all efforts on making peace with Sweden, to get involved in a chaos of complex diplomatic intrigues that required subtle political instincts, sophisticated diplomacy and financial resources, which he lacked.

As for diplomatic intrigues... Peter led them, "scattering his nieces in the remote corners of the German world... Peter was drawn into court squabbles and petty dynastic interests of a huge feudal web... German relations turned Peter's entire foreign policy upside down, made him friends as enemies, without making enemies friends, and he again began to rush from side to side, almost being entangled in the plan of the Holsteiner Gern, who served the Swedish king ... who wanted to reconcile Sweden with Russia, so that they would overthrow the Hanoverian Elector from the English throne and restore they were setting up the Stuarts... When this fantastic undertaking came to light, Peter went to France to impose his daughter Elizabeth as a bride on the young Louis XV and with this matrimonial allowance to find an ally in his constant opponent... So the main task... was exchanged for Mecklenburg , Saxon and Danish trifles that extended the agonizing 7-year war for another 12 years"?.

Let us pay tribute to Charles XI - he, as promised, fought until the very last hour and fell in battle. In 1715 he finally, after a 15-year absence, appeared in Sweden. He tried to rein in the Riksdag, to force the country to make another effort... His death near the Norwegian fortress of Frederikshall raised many questions... According to official data, the king was shot from the fortress, and many saw the barrel of the gun and the flash of the shot.

'  
Bushkov A.A. Russia, which was not. M., 1997. S. 394.

2 Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 2. Rostov-on-Don, 2000. S. 512-513.

107

arrow between teeth. But it seems that others saw you arrows and smoke in a completely different place, from the depths of the SWEDISH positions ... It was after THIS shot that the king clutched his chest and collapsed ... And the gun from the fortress ... There was a war, and such trunks stuck out over a lot of fortifications.

I will not insist on anything, but the death of Charles XI (he was only 35 years old) is one of the mysteries of history that have not been solved to this day. It may very well be that the Riksdag thus got rid of a too belligerent king.

... And Peter, having lost the opportunity to end the war

by 1710 or 1711, fussed for several more years, spending fantastic funds and losing tens of thousands of people. One in battle - two or three from hunger and cold.

## FLEET

Even more enthusiastically than about the reforms of the army by Peter, it is supposed to write about the "creation of the fleet." Like, the "great reformer" came, saw that there was no fleet. And he won, of course, built a fleet. And Peter saw that it was good. Here are the successors of Peter, people limited and short-sighted, they did not understand the charms of the fleet, and the fleet almost completely rotted until Catherine II. The great one did not catch on and did not rebuild the fleet on a new one.

Perhaps, in this brief ironic reference, I have covered the main stereotypes according to which it was supposed (and even now it is supposed) to talk about a great deed - about the creation of a fleet by Peter. But this is at best a misunderstanding: Peter did not create the Russian fleet at all. He destroyed the Russian fleet, and if there was justice in the world, this is what all textbooks would be talking about today.

In pre-Petrine Muscovy, there really was no or almost no navy. The squadron of Kravkov or the fleet built by Ordyn-Nashchokin on the Western Dvina during the war with Sweden in 1658 "pulls" at best for a "military-river" or "military-coastal" fleet, no more. But there was a fishing and merchant fleet in Muscovy in the 17th century. Pomeranian lodia-kochi

108

reached England and Svalbard, and the mighty Caspian beads went to Persia and Azerbaijan.

Let's not be hypocritical, as if the ancestors had nothing to borrow in Holland. The ships of pre-Petrine Russia in two respects differed from the Dutch and English ones for the worse - they had "worse" contours, were noticeably "bulger" than high-speed ocean-going ships. If in the advanced countries of Europe the ratio between the width and length of the vessel was customary to maintain as 1:6, even 1:8, then the bead had a ratio between the width and length of about 1:4.

The second difference is that the Dutch ships had more slanting sails, and therefore these ships could maneuver better in winds from different directions and "caught" a weak wind worse.

As a result, the Dutch and English ships were more agile and faster, and fewer people were needed to manage them.

But I note: single-masted (the bus had 3 masts) sailing dhows of the Arabs in the 15th-17th centuries mastered the entire Indian Ocean and still sail on it.

In the 15th century, the Chinese fleet of the court eunuch of Emperor Zheng He reached India and the east coast of Africa from Canton. Then the emperor changed, the fleet was no longer needed, but the fact itself is significant - not only Dutch ships are suitable for ocean voyages. Yes, and the Spanish galleon, which easily sailed across the Atlantic, is not much better equipped and, of course, no larger than the Caspian bead.

That is, if the Muscovite ships were inferior to the Dutch and English, then not by much. In addition to what has been said, let us add that there was not the slightest need to swim across the oceans in Muscovy at that time.

And, finally, who, in fact, prevented Peter from improving the Russian fleet, not at all destroying it, but introducing into the traditions of building ships what was necessary to take from Europe (including importing specialists from Holland)?

But none of this was realized, much less done. The Muscovite fleet was ordered to be destroyed, and it was not

109

became. After that, there was no fleet on the Caspian Sea for a long time - neither merchant nor military. But Peter wanted to swim in the Caspian! And not only in the Caspian...

In 1716, he sent Prince Bekovich-Cherkassky not just anywhere, but to Central Asia! And not for any reason, but to find the old channel of the Amu Darya, which used to flow not into the Aral Sea, but into the Caspian. Before Bekovich-Cherkassky the task was set - to let the Amu Darya again along this channel! The Amu Darya will flow into the Caspian, and Peter's fleet will be able to rise along the Amu Darya and penetrate into the very heart of Asia. In addition, it would not be bad to persuade the Khivans to transfer to Muscovite citizenship, and to look for gold in the channel of the Amu Darya. 5,000 soldiers were given to carry out the task, and they were ordered not to tarry, not to mess around for too long.

Even for Peter, this idea is so fantastic that it is hard to believe in it. I mean, you could even think of something like that! I wonder if the Kabardian prince Devlet-Kizden-Murza, who became Alexander Bekovich-Cherkassky in baptism, understood this? Or, sailing to Astrakhan, then to the Turkmen coast, moving through the deserts to Khiva, he did not realize himself as a suicide bomber? I do not know this. I know for sure that in Khiva for a long time they did not understand what to do with this impudent man? In the East, it is difficult to believe in threats, arrogance, fan-

tactical demands not backed by force. But it took time to figure it out: yes, these 5,000 were the only ones, and other Muscovite troops were several thousand kilometers away. And then the Khivans attacked the unsuspecting soldiers sleeping in different places and slaughtered them. Prince Alexander also died.

But Peter | and built a fleet! For the Black Sea - near Voronezh, for the Baltic - in many places! Yes, he built ... He built, but not a fleet, but something incomprehensible. Something hastily brewed, without any observance of technology. All the fleets built by Peter were knocked together in a shock short time from a damp forest, the devil

1 Illeritsky V. Expedition of Prince Cherkassky to Khiva (1716-1717) // Historical Journal, 1940. No. 7.

110

which, and were floating coffins barely floating on the surface of the water.

The ability to choose wood for building a ship, the ability to properly dry, taking into account the varieties and types of wood, the direction and strength of the wind, humidity, lighting, and so on, were considered the most important skills of a shipbuilder.

It was no less important to tar the tree, to impregnate it with tar, resin. Again, it was important to know exactly how to impregnate wood, what proportions of resin to take, to what temperature to heat, how many times to impregnate. Many craftsmen kept the secrets of their own mixtures for impregnating ship timber. For this "know-how" alone, both firms and states bought experienced shipbuilders, keepers of the secrets of perfection, from each other.

The more diligently the drying and impregnation technology was observed, the longer the ship could serve. In the English fleet, which smashed Napoleon at Trafalgar in 1806, there were ships that remembered the times of Peter. A carved naiad, gazing into the glowing waters of Trafalgar Bay, a century earlier could have looked into the waters of the White Sea, and the lanky king of the barbarians examined her, clapped his hand, standing in a boat jumping on the waves.

It is difficult to say how the fate of the Black Sea Fleet could have turned out: after all, it was burned after 1711. But the fate of the Baltic Fleet can be traced quite well, and it should be noted that this is a very gloomy fate. Because this fleet, built without observing technological rules, rotted in the most primitive way. After all, build ships extremely hastily: "Come on, come on!", "Time does not wait to be there by tomorrow!"

Until 1708, there were only small frigates and rowboats in the Baltic, and only from 1709 did the accelerated construction of the fleet and Kronstadt begin. But until 1714 only 50-gun ships were built, and in 1712-1714 sixteen 50-60-gun ships had to be bought from the West.

True, in the years 1713-1714 in Arkhangelsk, seven 52-gun ships were built from larch, but the hardships

111

were such that since 1715 the construction of ships in Arkhangelsk was curtailed.

In 1715, out of 20 active ships, 16 were bought abroad, and all construction plans were not regularly carried out. In 1718, it was planned to build nine 70-gun ships and twelve 66-gun ships, but in reality only one 70-gun ship was built.

Moreover, after the death of Peter, the construction of the ships of the Baltic Fleet is almost curtailed. In 1726, only one 54-gun ship was laid down; in 1727-1730, no new ships were built at all.

Under Anna, there were discussions about ships, and even an opinion was expressed: maybe the sailing fleet in the Baltic is not really needed at all? Maybe leave only the galleys there?

At the end of 1731, there were 36 linear, 12 frigates, 2 shnyavis - but this is all on paper. In fact, only 8 ships from this fleet could sail in the ocean and 13 in the Baltic, near the coast. In 1741, the fleet simply could not leave the harbor to meet the Swedish fleet. In 1742, he simply did not dare to leave the harbor, although the Swedish fleet was superior in number of pennants.

The fact is that the average age of the ship's service was 5 years, then the ships rotted in a vulgar way. Moreover, semi-fresh water has a bad effect even on ships built in compliance with the proper technology. And here, even with the slightest malfunction, ships had to be driven to St. Petersburg, on completely fresh water - in Kronstadt the entire repair base was very weak, and the ships were hardly brought to the capital.

Construction cost such a pretty penny that a floating coffin made of raw oak and with a service life of five years turned out to be as if cast in gold. After all, the nearest oak forests from St. Petersburg are 600 kilometers away, on the Don and on the Volga! Transportation of trunks is terribly expensive, the landlords did not want to cut down these forests, considering them their valuable asset, and if the forest was still cut down, they did not want to plant oaks, not understanding anything in the field.

the formation of forests.

112

As a result, under Anna a moderate program was adopted - to build ships for 66 guns, no more, but even this program was "safely" forgotten.

It was believed that it was necessary to build a fleet according to foreign models, to lick it down to the details from the Dutch one - so they built it! It got to the point that modern scientists seriously assert: probably, the Russians before Peter did not have a special word for the designation of the sea coast! The word "shore" meant only the border of something freshwater, a river or a lake ... Otherwise, why would it be in the Russian fleet of the 17th century, the coast was called the Dutch word VOM "KYUST".

The Black Sea Fleet was built in the same place where Grigory Ivanovich Kasogov built it in 1674: near Voronezh. Kasogov's ships were not, of course, ships of the class of Dutch or English frigates and brigantines. These were rowing and sailing ships, galleys and scampavees, on which Grigory Ivanovich transferred troops along the rivers to the Sea of Azov.

Kasogov's fleet, a squadron of 60 pennants, performed these tasks superbly, transporting troops near Azov and attacking Turkish and Tatar fortresses on the Crimean coast. Kasogov, on the other hand, carefully studied one feature of the Don flow... The fact is that some rivers flow very widely when they flow into the sea, their flow speed decreases, and at the mouth their depth is less than in most of the channel. This feature of the Don was well known to Russians, Cossacks, and Turks. Because of her, the Turks never brought large ships into the Don and, if Azov was besieged, they helped the fortress on small ships or on flat-bottomed galleys.

The government of Muscovy was interested in whether it was still possible to bring large ships from the Don to the Sea of Azov, such as Dutch warships or the Caspian three-masted bead. Peter, when he began to build a fleet near Voronezh, knew for sure that these ships would be able to enter the Sea of Azov!

Bykhovsky I.A. Petrovsky shipbuilders. L., 1982. S. 14.

113

The new Black Sea Fleet under Peter was built by 26 thousand people of the Belgorod category in 1695 and 1696. Baltiysky was originally built in Arkhangelsk with its old school of Russian shipbuilders. What was the obstacle in attracting shipbuilders to the construction of the fleet

from near Voronezh or from villages and towns along the banks of the Oka, from Astrakhan, where ships were built for the Caspian Sea? What hindered? Who interfered? And nothing ... except the desire of the king.

But after all, besides the "tree" itself - ships and ropes, the fleet is also people who know how to control ships - naval officers, specialists, sailors. They didn't exist...

Of course, it was possible to take Pomors or Astrakhans, who knew how to drive Caspian beads on the high seas, into service in the fleet. But this, of course, would be profoundly wrong! There is no "real" fleet in Muscovy, the real one is only overseas...

For a recruit from a continental province, from the center of Muscovite Rus', where no sea had been seen for a century, the fleet was a completely incomprehensible thing, and even smacked of sulfur. "You will be sent to the fleet!" - and the guy runs, breaks the head of the escort with his own shackles and nailed to the robbers. Those who got into the fleet, even if they did not suffer from seasickness, if there were no other problems, did not want to learn how to be good sailors, and there was almost no one to teach them. Life on the ship was so unusual, strange, melancholy seized the sailors so terribly that they again fled or simply fell into a stupor, did not want to continue to live. The authorities stole terribly, and after all, on ships in the open sea, even in the roadstead, you can't steal anything, and there's no one to ask for alms.

In 1716, Admiral Devier wrote to Peter: "Here we have gained such fame that it will not fade away even in a thousand years. About 150 people from the Senyavin team have already died, and many have already been thrown into the water into the canal, and now 12 dead people have been brought to the yards, and the local people complain about it,

'Essays on the history of the USSR. XVI century / Ed. N.M. Druzhinin. M., 1955. S. 440-441.

114

and some ministers have told me and want to send it to the king."

How did Peter react? But no way.

Another admiral of Tsar Peter, Paddon, in 1717, due to rotten food, lost 222 recruits out of 500 in just a month, and the rest "read to die of hunger, find themselves in such a poor condition from deprivation of clothes that they fear they will soon die." The same Paddon wrote that "the Russian fleet, as a result of bad food, lost twice as many people against any foreign fleet."

It is characteristic that this was written by an Englishman, because the English sailing fleet was the place where mothers scare naughty children. The English sailor, as a rule, was lured by special recruiters who scoured the taverns. A strong guy fit for service was both soldered and persuaded, and, it happened, they simply poured a sleeping potion into a glass of good English ale. And the fleet was hungry, and water was not always in abundance, and wild customs, and flogging with a nine-tailed whip. As a result, they used to say that it is difficult to find a tribe in the Pacific Islands that does not include one or two runaway English sailors ...

If this is an exaggeration, it is not a very big one, because the expedition of Kotzebue in 1819 found a fugitive Englishman on each of the islands of the Marquesas archipelago that she visited, and even two on the island of Nuku Hiva - an Englishman and a Frenchman.

In fact, Paddon is known for his humane treatment of sailors, but he began to serve in the English fleet, and it was not easy to impress him ...

And this is, after all, talking about the times when the fleet still "did not leave the royal favor", when the fleet was fed financially, and it was possible to pay for abuses. But as soon as Peter died, for whom the fleet was and remained a favorite toy, even that was gone.

In Russia, it was generally believed that the fleet existed - after all, something was rotten there in the roadstead, the sides were sticking out

115

and masts over the gray Baltic water. But this was considered purely theoretical, because the Russian state simply did not have tasks for which the fleet is really needed. That's when such tasks appeared, when in the era of "mother Catherine" the urgent task arose of sending a fleet to the Mediterranean Sea and harassing the Turks there, it turned out that there was practically no fleet in Russia.

Catherine's courtiers used to think of themselves as pampered and living in a hall and in civilization, compared to the harsh times of the founder of the Russian Empire, Peter. But it was they, these pampered dandies in lace shirts and speaking French with almost no accent, who created the fleet, in fact, from nothing.

By the beginning of the 20th century, maritime traditions of the Russian Empire had developed. An important role in these traditions was played by people from the Kostroma province, where the Novgorod nobility had been resettled ("transferred") back in the time of Ivan!! Three centuries have passed, and the descendants of Russian



(but not Muscovite) sailors were given to the world by Nevelsky, Lisyansky, the Butakov family and many, many others. Another group of naval officers in the Russian Empire was the Baltic Germans, "trophy foreigners" (Litke, Wrangel, Krusenstern, Kotzebue). So everything is back to normal...

## PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REFORM

The refrain sounds from the pages of many books: "Peter created new state institutions! Peter abolished the old system of government!"

But in the first years of Peter's reign, he did not even think of changing anything. The country lived, governed by the same orders and orders, under the same Boyar Duma. In 1705, there were 17 boyars in Moscow, 17 okolnichy, 1 дума nobleman (our old acquaintance - Nikita Moiseevich Zotov), 3 дума clerks. The Boyar Duma was never abolished by Peter and died out in the most literal sense - from old age: Peter did not favor new

116

дума ranks, and as the former дума people died, there was no one to take their place. But, at least until 1704, the Дума met regularly, and it was she who ruled the state in the absence of the tsar (and he was constantly absent).

Among all other cases, in 1700 the boyars were ordered to correlate the Code of 1649 with new decrees and include decrees in the Code ...

In 1704, in the absence of the tsar, it was ordered not to rule the Boyar Дума, but the "consilia of ministers", and by "ministers" are meant the heads of the most important departments.

In the same way, the Chief Magistrate was supposed to govern the cities, and Peter orders the arrested to be delivered to the Moscow City Hall - but, of course, in practice this turns out to be the most common moving out hut. So Tom Sawyer, playing the game of liberating princes and dukes, called a pickaxe a knife, and a log cabin in Mississippi called a palace. Don't believe your ears...

No mention has been made of the meetings of the Boyar Дума since 1704, but it is completely incomprehensible whether it disappeared or not? If not, then with the introduction of the "consilia of ministers" the Boyar Дума is not abolished at all, and it becomes completely incomprehensible who should govern the country? Which of the two authorities?

In 1711, going to the ever-memorable Prut

campaign, Peter creates a new authority - the Senate. 9 senators, headed by the chief secretary, were appointed by Peter from the highest officials of the "first three ranks",

Until 1718 (that is, most of the time of Peter's reign), orders still worked. They are being reformed, new ones are being introduced. In 1701, the Foreign and Reiter orders merged into one order of the Military Affairs. There were Monastic, Artillery Affairs, Mining, Pro Viansky, Naval orders. That is, no one canceled the orders, we are talking only about the growth of the already existing bureaucracy.

In 1718, Peter starts new organs - 9, later 12 colleges. Three of them—Foreign, Admiralty, and Military—were immediately singled out and called "the first." He himself defines what a collegium is like this:

117

"... Meetings of many persons... in which presidents or chairmen do not have such power as the old judges - they did what they wanted." Theoretically, all matters were to be decided in collegiums by general discussion, and everyone had an equal vote, only the president, if opinions differed, had a decisive vote.

The notion that "orders have been replaced by colleges"! and that the orders simply disappeared is not true. The orders, in any case, survived Peter, and the Siberian order was preserved until 1763.

The Senate in its functions differs in no way from the Boyar Duma, but in its social composition it differs, and not for the better. Owners of estates, financially independent from the tsar, or officials who had made a career, got into the Boyar Duma either "by a great breed". Now - only chi NOVNIKI who have made a career.

Of course, this Senate has nothing to do with the Senate of Ancient Rome, in which the richest people of the Roman Republic and Empire sat, limiting the power of even the most unbridled Caesars. As is his custom, Peter gave a grand historical name to a body that was organized quite differently from the Roman Senate.

Another example of the same thing is the loud name "Kumpans" for the associations that were supposed to build the ships of the Black Sea Fleet.

Well, what does this have to do with the "companies" of Western merchants?

The same goes for colleges—Peter took this word from Leibniz, who called "colleges" the highest organs of government in his ideal state, something like a mini-

sterst. As for the real Petrine collegiums, they are not only no better, they are in many respects worse than orders.

What about local government? In 1707-1710, the provinces were created: Moscow, Smolensk, Kiev, Azov, Kazan, Arkhangelsk, Nizhny Novgorod, Astrakhan

1Yurganov A.L., Katsva L.A. History of Russia 1700—1800 centuries. M., 1996. S. 266.

118

Skye, Siberian. The former uyezds took shape gradually, historically. Provinces were introduced for the needs of maintaining the army and for the convenience of administration. In 1771, all the regiments were assigned to the provinces. The provinces must now maintain regiments that were named after the "leading" provinces: the Kazan regiment, the Smolensk regiment, and so on.

It was very difficult to govern each of the vast provinces; the bureaucracy grew enormously. In pre-Petrine Rus', at least there were not very many local officials. And then there were literally hordes of them.

The system of territorial division was written off from the Swedish one, but, as Peter explained, "and which items in the Swedish regulations are inconvenient, or are dissimilar to the situation of this state, and put them according to your own reasoning."

The senators had a peculiar idea of which points were the most inconvenient; the provinces were divided into 20 provinces, and the provinces into counties and districts (producing new crowds of officials). An inconvenient "point" turned out to be the grassroots element of the Swedish administrative system: the kirchspiel, that is, the parish. It was led by a pastor with the participation of parishioners elected. And so what, officials were not going to allow self-government.

"All kinds of outfits and parcels come by decree from the cities, and not from the churches, and besides, there are no smart people in the county and the peasantry," this was said in the corresponding resolution of the Senate.

Muscovite Rus knew complex forms of self-government. At the end of the 17th century, the entire vast country was ruled by 10,000 officials at most. Elected from the communities took over the rest of the work. We have to admit that Peter's provincial reform is "progressive" only in name. It is a step back towards bureaucracy and despotism. That is, of course, the beautiful foreign words "gubernia" and "district" sound much better than the old-fashioned ones and

steel "volosts" OR "counties"! In all other respects, a step back, as with the boards.

119

Interestingly, in the modern Republic of Poland, the territory is divided into voivodeships, and the voivode is at the head of the voivodeships. There is even such a Latin-Slavic phonetic freak as vice-voivode, that is, deputy governor. It is hard to deny that Poland is a completely modern and completely European state. Strangely, the preservation of the historical name for administrative units did not prevent this. And somehow the "districts" did not help Russia much either.

The introduction by Peter of a special "spiritual college" to semi-official historians of the last century had to be justified by the corruption and complete decline of the clergy before Peter. CM. Solovyov spends several pages of text to describe the whole abyss of the fall of clerics, and literally half a page to describe the actions of Peter himself, falling into a tongue twister at this point.

The circumstances of the case are as follows: in October 1700 Patriarch Adrian died. After his death, the tsar did not allow the consecrated Council to meet to elect a new patriarch. By decree of December 16, 1700, Metropolitan Stefan Yavorsky was appointed "exarch of the most holy patriarchal throne, guardian and administrator." The guardian of the patriarchal throne, therefore, is, but the patriarch himself is not there for an indefinite period. In January 1701, wasting no time, Peter abolished the patriarchal rank and introduced the Monastic Order, a bureaucratic institution for the management of church property.

The clergy repeatedly ask Peter to allow them to elect a new patriarch, but he keeps silent for many years (not forgetting to manage the monastic property and derive income from it).

Only in 1721 (more than twenty years since the last patriarch died!) was published the "Spiritual Regulation" - a document in which the undesirability of the patriarchate is very straightforwardly justified; the undesirability consists in the fact that the "common people" see the second tsar in the patriarch...

The Spiritual Board was immediately created, headed by the same Stefan Yavorsky. According to one report, Peter received the higher clergy by pounding his fist on the table, where

120

the Charter of the Theological College was already ready. According to others, he acted even more decisively: after a request for

to allow the election of a patriarch, he drew a knife, drove it with force into the boards of the table. And he growled: "Here is a paper patriarch for you! - And at these words he pointed at the written USs tav. "If you don't like it, here's a damask patriarch for you!"

It is difficult to judge which version is more truthful.

The Theological Board turned out to be very unusual, it is quickly renamed the Holy Synod, but it's not the names that matter. The church under Peter turned into a state institution, and Sino and a secular man, the chief prosecutor, supervised the work. Decrees were read from the pulpit and criminals were cursed, and special decrees required regular attendance at church and confession.

And the Synod in the same year of 1722 decided that the priest, having learned about the anti-state sentiments of the parishioner, is OBLIGED to inform him. If the priest did not inform, he was subject to defrocking, confiscation of property and the death penalty.

Fantasists, among whom the first was, perhaps, Orell, love to come up with terrible dystopias in which the state and its officials implant electrodes in people's brains or give suspicious chemical preparations, from which they become completely weak-willed and blurt out all their even the most intimate and the most terrible secrets. But how does the state of Peter differ from such a dystopia? The subject is OBLIGED to go to church and confess. The priest MUST deliver. It turns out that a subject, having started a conspiracy or created an anti-government group, must choose between lying in confession (which is a sin before God) or actual denunciation of himself...

It probably makes sense to recall that the secret of confession from time immemorial has been considered sacred: after all, a parishioner, strictly speaking, tells it not to a priest - a man in a cassock, but to God. The priest had to die rather than divulge the secret of confession; Peter, on the other hand, decided to kill the priest precisely for the fulfillment of his pastoral duty.

121

Some historians believe that one of the reasons, and even the main reason, of the disasters that struck Russia in the 20th century is rooted here. In their opinion, before Peter the Church still remained an independent force from the state, and most importantly, a source of authority. This source disappeared (because the Church itself became part of the state apparatus), and man found himself face to face with the vastness of the all-powerful, penetrating into all states...

I'll add to what has been said ... no, I'd better quote P.N. Milyukov: "between the three instances of central administration - the council of ministers, the senate and the collegium -

mi - there was no correct hierarchical relationship: the power of constituent, legislative and executive interfered in a disorderly way in each of them.

In (the Senate, lieutenant-chancellor Shafirov scolded Chief Prosecutor Skornyakov-Pisarev as a thief, and from the provinces the same news: "the voivode scolded ... the chamberlain with vulgar words", in another province "the chamberlain dared to dishonor the voivode with beatings", in the third "the voivode and the kama Rir beat the zemstvo commissar with mortal combat." After all, all of these are people of different departments, in no way correlated with each other, and it is not clear how they should cooperate.

So all the negative aspects of the command system under Peter were alive, and even got worse. The old command system, headed by the Boyar Duma, COULD exist without a tsar. And the "new system" of government created by Peter could not exist for a single day without the personal intervention of the tsar, and when he disappeared, the government of the country plunged into complete chaos.

And so it turns out something sad: all the hundreds of times praised reforms of Peter are either purely external renaming (Dumas into consilia, then into the Senate), or even harmful changes that breed bureaucracy and create management bodies WORSE than they were before. Like a collegium is worse than an order, and a province is worse than a county.

\ Milyukov P.N. Essays on Russian culture. T.2.M., 1994. S. 236. 122

However, all this is largely lyrical, because all the old and new institutions almost did not rule under Peter. The country lived in the regime of control by only one,

but "on the other hand" an all-powerful person.

Already in 1704, after another groan of the king, "is it possible for one person to see so many! The Cabinet was created - the personal office of the tsar with a considerable staff of officials headed by Alexei Vasilyevich Makarov. There was also a nearby field office, headed by the same Zotov, "the closest adviser and close to the office, the president general," this office went everywhere for the tsar. But the main chancellery was still the Cabinet, and Makarov acquired colossal significance: after all, it was he who decided which paper would fall on the tsar's table today, and which only the day after tomorrow. And, of course, Makarov could always present the document in such a way that the decision on it would be positive ... or negative.

telny.

Before the unborn, poor Makarov, the noblest nobles and all-powerful dignitaries began to curry favor.

NIKI...

And the legendary 20,000 decrees fell upon the country, plunging it into a state of emergency.

Stunned by the abundance of decrees, local officials simply lost any semblance of initiative. The Solikamsk voivode asked the royal personal permission to repair the prison: the prison there was so dilapidated that "the arrests of that one look will scatter." The Moscow governor did not dare to repair the wooden pavement destroyed by the flood without a royal decree.

The Boyar Duma, no matter how scolded it was, knew how to take responsibility in solving any cases; in "conzi Liya", the "ministers" tried to skip meetings, and if they did, they tried not to take responsibility for anything: how it would turn out there ... In 1707, Peter even issued a special decree: let the boyars who They come to the konzilium, write down the cases being solved,

123

and each minister signs with his own hand. So to speak, he leaves written evidence against himself.

The population, it seems, did not understand at all where to sail and which shores to hold on to. In 1698, Peter burst into edicts banning sharp-pointed knives (so as not to arm robbers) and obligatory wearing short clothes, of the Hungarian or German type. Anyone who appeared on the streets in a "non-statutory" dress was to be put on his knees and cut off the dress at ground level. Those who made, kept, wore, used, sold sharp-pointed knives, were waiting for a whip, exile, disgrace ... the usual Peter's set.

How the population had to slaughter cattle, butcher carcasses, dress leather with round-ended knives is beyond my understanding. Anyone who has ever done this knows that it is impossible.

In 1700, the famous profit-maker Andrei Kurbatov wrote about the need to repeat the decrees on the wearing of German and Hungarian dresses and on the ban on sharp knives - these decrees are not carried out, and many do not even know that such decrees were issued.

The country turned out to be virtually ruled by no one; performance discipline fell monstrously, the theft of officials became the norm. Even the old employees, who started under Alexei Mikhailovich, are corrupted by the lawlessness organized by the tsar himself.

Andrey Andreevich Vinus, the son of a Dutchman, the founder of a metallurgical plant, Peter is actually high

appreciated - for knowledge of languages, for intelligence, for honesty.

But Vinus could not resist, he began to accept all sorts of "dachas", and Peter began to cool off towards him ... And Menshikov, of course, made every effort to make Peter learn more about Vinus' embezzlement and bribery.

In 1703, Andrei Andreevich Vinus, under the threat of dismissal from the service, turned to Menshikov: he asked for intercession, brought three boxes of gold, 150 gold coins, 300 rubles of money and gave a letter with an obligation to give 5,000 rubles and 7 boxes of gold.

124

Menshikov sends a letter to the tsar, in which he reports that Vinus was completely justified. And at the same time he sends another letter to the tsar, in which he announces that A.A. Vinus turned out to be unable to justify himself in anything (after which the old man runs abroad with a fright) ...

Vinus in tastes and views was a completely Russified person, and when he found himself abroad in 1708, he very quickly began to tearfully ask to be allowed to return to his homeland to die. To Peter's credit, he did not pursue the 65-year-old man and allowed him to return.

Much is characteristic of this story - both the morals of Peter's associates, and the generally insignificant sums embezzled by Vinus. Well, what to do, in other times he was brought up, he did not really know how to steal ....

Peter, as always, found a way out: he began to introduce new bureaucratic systems to oversee the old ones!

Where his experience is really unique is the creation of a special service of fiscals, that is, official whistleblowers. In March 1711, 500 officials, officially called "fiscals", were headed by the chief fiscal, and their only official service was "to find out cases of abuse and report to the Senate, regardless of rank and title."

Even if the fiscal makes a false denunciation, but due to ignorance of the details, it's not scary: Peter believed that "it's better to make a mistake by not reporting than by silence." And what kind of fiscal confesses that he knew all the details of the case and reported it not by mistake, but out of spiritual obscenity?!

However, profit-makers very often also worked in the role of fiscals, who could find income for the state precisely in finding the abused official and forcing him to "share" with the state (and with the profit-maker himself, who received part of the "booty").

Peter generally tended to "share" with those who



helps to put into practice his decrees. So did the kings of the West during the colonial wars, when all soldiers, depending on their rank, received their share of the loot. And when Sir Robert Clive, commander-in-chief of the troops of the East India Company, was given

125

on trial, he calmly and cynically told where he got the money from: "There were not so many diamonds, just a few baskets. Here we collected two or three barrels of emeralds ... Personally, I took only two hundred thousand pounds for myself. I marvel at my modesty, gentlemen." Indeed, Robert Clive's modesty can only be marveled at, for two hundred thousand pounds is one of the largest fortunes in England at that time.

But the plundering of Bengal is a reality of the colonial war. And Peter transferred them to his own country, to Muscovy. Let's say, in 1705, another decree was issued: to catch the beggars, turn them into soldiers, and the decrepit or completely sick - into monks; beggars were forbidden to serve. Whoever wants to do charity work, let him donate money to the Monastyrsky Prikaz, where they will find a use for it. Whether there were many who wanted to give money to the Monastic order, it is difficult to say. But there was also such a clause of the decree: if someone is caught giving money to a beggar, they should be taken to the Monastic order and take a fine. Half of the fine goes to the treasury, the second half goes to the clerk who catches the alms giver. Here are the clerks and walked through the streets of the city with soldiers and caught those who filed.

How does this practice differ from the practice of plundering Bengal by the British? Perhaps in scale: after all, two hundred thousand pounds cannot be knocked out of compassionate merchants by any batogs, and emeralds are difficult to find in the hats of beggars.

Of the guards, Peter established special commissions to investigate the work of institutions and individuals. The commissions consisted of officers of three ranks: major, captain and lieutenant. The commission officially, by a special decree, received the authority to consider cases not according to the law (and anyway, officers do not understand jurisprudence), but "according to common sense and justice."

Let me ask myself a perplexed question: how do these commissions differ from the revolutionary troikas that did business "according to revolutionary legal consciousness"?

But even the communists did not put members of the revolutionary troika at meetings of other state bodies. Au Petra

126

even at meetings of the Senate there was a guardsman who was charged with the duty of arresting those who would behave "inappropriately and indecently." And the members of the Senate, in the words of the envoy Weber, "had to appear before some lieutenant, who judged them and demanded an account from them."

A caustic question: did Peter still seriously want the Senate, not in words, in deeds, to be similar to that of the ancient Roman Senate?!

Even to such a high-ranking person as Field Marshal B.M. Sheremetev, some Mikhail Shchepotiev, a guards sergeant, was assigned, and Sheremetev wrote to his matchmaker Golovin about this: "He told the whole people that he was sent to watch me and that he would report so that I would listen to him in everything." In another letter - more: "... I ask that Mikhail Shchepotiev be taken from me ... constantly drunk. I am afraid of what he did not teach me; launches rockets day and night, it is dangerous that cities

didn't burn out."

And Sheremetev could not drive away Shchepotiev's cattle himself so as not to get under his feet: after all, Shchepotiev brought with him the tsar's handwritten letter that he, Shchepotiev, "was ordered to be with you for some time and that he will inform, if you please, fix it." And the surreal subordination of the field marshal to the sergeant continued.

The Finance Board demanded accountability from the provinces, and in 1718 a demand was sent throughout the country to send statistics of income and expenditure. Not a single piece of paper was sent by any province; in 1719 they remembered ... again silence. The guards went to work and, as befits a brave military people, overcame the su-stats-orders. Fortunately, they had instructions from the tsar himself: "Shackle by the legs and put a chain around the neck and keep it in order until all the necessary statements are prepared." This instruction was carried out by the guardsmen everywhere, except for the province of Azov: there the officials by force escaped from under the guard and fled in all directions.

But even where the guardsmen overcame, no one compiled statements - apparently, they simply did not know how. No matter how heroic

127

the guardsmen were wailing, even in 1721 "above" they did not know anything about the expenses and incomes of the provinces.

However, the most fun began in 1718: peace negotiations with Sweden finally began. Everything would be fine, but what to do with a huge army of 200 thousand people, led by 30 generals? How to feed and maintain her? On November 26, 1718, another decree followed, by which Peter, firstly, ordered to inform

the number of people living in each province, county, volost, district. Simultaneously, a per capita census of the population was carried out. Secondly, Peter "lay out the army on the ground", that is, he placed regiments around the country, in different provinces, for feeding. The regiments had to be placed "in perpetual quarters", by company, rebuilding each regiment and company in its own special settlement, with company yards and regimental yards for commanders and headquarters. At the same time, the army was ordered to check the accuracy of the "audit", that is, the census.

Two things should immediately be noted.

1. Special settlements were supposed to be built by 1726, but for some time they had just prepared timber for construction, and even then not everywhere. They gave a deadline of 1730, but even then only headquarters yards were built, and a huge amount of timber prepared for construction was lost.

2. The auditors had to "of course" submit their "revision tales" by the beginning of 1724. All the auditors reported that by January 1724 it was impossible to finish anything. The deadline was moved to March in order to start collecting the poll tax from 1725. But the auditors did not return and on January 28, 1725, until the death of Peter.

But this is so, to understand the overall picture.

The regiment, located in the county, took on many functions: keeping the peasants from escaping, catching the fugitives, hunting for robbers, Old Believers and thieves, overseeing illegal logging, combating smuggling and illegal distilling, supervision of citizens

sky officials.

As expected, the powers of the military gradually expanded. Soon the military was already collecting a stuffy tribute, giving out passports to the peasants, leaving

128

to earn money in the winter, and ensured the 100% attendance of the nobles at meetings. The colonel officially became the judge in all clashes between local residents and soldiers. And then the regimental authorities were completely instructed to "watch over the governors and governors ....

The poll tax was collected by the military in much the same way as it was done in India by the British, and on the island of Java by the Dutch. "The regimental teams that led the collection of tribute were more ruinous than the tribute itself. It met in thirds of the year, and each expedition lasted two months. For six months of the year, villages and villages lived in panic horror from armed collectors, kept at the expense of the townsfolk, among penalties and executions. I can't guarantee whether the Baskaks from the time of Batu behaved worse in conquered Russia.

In the Kazan province, one of the regiments lost half of those who were supposed to support them in just 2 years: more than 13 thousand souls "went on the run".

The documents of the Senate of 1727 say quite definitely: "The poor Russian peasants are ruined and run not only from the lack of grain and the poll tax, but also from the disagreement of the officers with the zemstvo rulers, and the soldiers with the peasants."

"Officers usually don't want to know the local authorities, they are rude and impudent to the governor, and when the governor complains to the colonel, it's good if the colonel rudely answers that it's not the governor's job to judge the behavior of gentlemen of the officers; he will send a command, take away the sword from the governor, put him under arrest, "like a real villain," one governor complained to the Senate.

At the checkpoint, moving in "because a person will have to come into the yard," the soldiers sometimes drove the hosts out into the street. This, of course, is an exception, an exception to the rule. But "at the apartments, the soldiers and dragoons stand so unruly and mend terrible grievances that it is impossible to count them. And where the officers stand, they repair them even more bitterly ... and for this reason, many are not happy with their homes, and in their offenses there is no trial of the sys-

'  
Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 2. Ros  
Tov-on-Don, 2000. S. 549.

129

There is nowhere to go: a military court is far from ordinary people, not only can a commoner not have access to it, but a military man will not soon find a court for an unequal person.

We are talking about a phenomenon quite exceptional: the occupation of his own country by his own army. Moreover, the Russian army behaves in Russia, as it is supposed to behave in a colony.

Poor Pososhkov, a merchant with considerable capital, was slandered in Novgorod by a certain colonel and even threatened with a sword.

In Kostroma, Colonel Tatarinov drove the members of the city magistrate out of the city.

In Kolomna, General Saltykov "beat the burgomaster with mortal combat."

A certain dragoon officer ordered another Kolomna burgomaster to be whipped, and his soldiers zealously carried out the order.

In Pskov, soldiers shot dead a member of the town hall, and the burgo-

Mistra was so beaten that he died from the beatings.

However, you can continue for a long time, almost to infinity.

So, perhaps, Peter nevertheless introduced some innovations in public administration.

1. Officially created the institute of fiscals.
2. Officially created the institution of profitmakers (more on that later).
3. He occupied his own country with his own army.
4. Introduced extrajudicial persecution through "revolutionaries".
5. He came up with a lot of completely fictitious government posts that remained decorations, and real, real political life went on outside all these "burgomasters" and "municipals".

All these innovations turned out to be even less durable than the colleges, and disappeared along with Peter himself. Do you regret it?

1 Semevsky M.I. The Secret Service of Peter I. Minsk, 1993.

Chapter 4

## CHANGES IN SOCIETY

Where are you flying, bird-troika?!

N.V. Gogol

## POLITICAL INVESTIGATION

It is difficult to call the political investigation an innovation of Peter, but it is a fact that under him this sinister phenomenon became incredibly active. In general, there is a clear pattern: the more the sovereign doubts his right to the throne, and the government doubts its legitimacy and the legitimacy of its actions, the stronger the political investigation and the tougher the regime. And the most self-confident, the most legitimate tsars and the most legitimate regimes are just the most calm and kind. There is also an inverse pattern - the level of political investigation can determine the degree of legitimacy of the regime and the self-confidence of the monarch...

Since 1695, all cases on the "Word and Deed of the Sovereign" were sent to the Preobrazhensky Prikaz, headed by

F.Yu. Romodanovsky, devoted like a dog to Tsar Peter. Since 1702, in general, the entire political investigation was concentrated in the Preobrazhensky Prikaz. "I am a monster, drunk all the days" - this is how Prince Kurakin characterized Romodanovsky. "He was distinguished by exceptional cruelty during the conduct of the investigation," notes an authoritative Soviet reference book, and this is the rare case that

131

where it is quite possible to agree with his assessments of Peter and his associates. Fyodor Yuryevich Romodanovsky was exceptionally, unbelievably cruel, even for those cruel times. He knew how to obtain testimony that was necessary or pleasing to Peter. For example, in the same "case of archers ....

From book to book, from essay to essay, the tale migrates, as if the archers, while Peter was abroad, "revolted". It turns out to be more difficult with specific circumstances: with slogans of rebellion, with a list of cities taken by the archers, places of battles with government troops ... Because all this does not exist. The Streltsy rebellion was invented by Peter from beginning to end, and then historians, from contemporaries, Tatishchev and Prokopovich, to Solov'yov and Klyuchevsky, retold the tale about the rebellion. Only S.G. Pushkarev, there is a clarification - they say, it's not a riot after all, but disobedience to an order ... And this, according to lawyers, is "a completely different

article".

Streltsy fled from the places where they were sent from Moscow. The archers were hungry, and it was not very clear what was the matter - in the usual "frugality" for Peter, or the archers who he did not like were deliberately starved. Their families remained in the Streltsy settlements, in Moscow, and the Streltsy wanted to return home. They refused to obey the order, and Gordon's soldiers easily scattered them with grapeshot: I repeat, the archers did not rebel at all, practically did not resist the government troops.

Romodanovsky conducted an investigation with his usual cruelty, but did not find any rebellion, and the archers were lightly punished: 56 heads flew off, the rest were sent back to their place of service.

But then Peter came from abroad ...

R. Massey, who was previously quoted by us, has a statement - they say that Peter was not at all cruel by nature, he tortured and killed "for the practical needs of the state." In my opinion, such dispassionate cruelty can rather be attributed to Romodanovsky. Peter also had such a completely impersonal cruelty, which had nothing to do with the personality of the person being tortured or doomed to

death. A freewheeling cog falls out of the huge machine of the state, or this mean cog plots against the machine... And Peter treats the "cog" accordingly, not really thinking about his own, this "cog", ideas, desires and feelings. This is evidenced by at least the most detailed, thoroughly developed by Peter personally "Rite, as the accused tries." To tell the truth, I simply do not want to present this terrible and disgusting document. Those who wish can read it in Bushkov's book.

According to I. Bunich, on some investigative documents of the time of Peter there is his own handwritten resolution: "Do not execute death. Hand over to doctors for experiments. We do not know whether the resolution was carried out and which of the doctors specifically conducted experiments on living people, but experiments on people are very in the spirit of that mechanical vision of life that is so characteristic of Peter, his monstrous indifference to man.

But in the case of archers, everything was not quite so ... Because Peter, in addition to the impartial cruelty of the STI of the "great statesman", very much knew quite biased cruelty to people, and to groups of the population, and to entire branches of the military. To the archers, who killed Matveev before his eyes, Peter was exceptionally partial. Before he had time to return to Moscow, the investigation, already completed, handed over to the archive, began to spin again. It was not enough for Peter to disobey the order, to march on Moscow with hunger. No! He needed a riot and a conspiracy, an attempt to overthrow and assassinate!

The archers began to be returned from the places where they were sent, they were terribly tortured, and Peter personally tortured the archers. Robert Massey tries his best to present the cruelty of the investigation under Peter as a kind of sign of the era. Like, everywhere it was equally terrible, in all European countries they were tortured in the same way, if not worse ... However, "for some reason" Peter tried his best to hide from the Europeans both the scale and methods of the investigation.

—s=s—\_—\_d\_

—\_ Bushkov A.A. Russia, which was not. M., 1997. S. 373-375. 133

The employees of the Danish embassy showed curiosity beyond reason, they entered Preobrazhenskoye to peep what was going on there? How true are the almost unbelievable rumors (apparently, for them, after all, torture was not such a daily occurrence)?

The Danes inspected several empty huts, where they found pools of blood on the floor and in the entryway, and blood-stained instruments of torture, when "screams, more rending than before, and

usually painful groans aroused in them a desire to look at the horrors taking place in the fourth hut. But as soon as they entered there, they hurried out in fear, "because they found Peter with his entourage, who was standing near a naked man, reared up on a rack.

"The king turned to those who entered, showing his displeasure with all his appearance that he was caught doing such an occupation." The foreigners jumped out, but Prince Naryshkin ran after them, asking who they were, where did they come from and what did they come for? The Danes were silent, and Lev Kirillovich announced to them that they should immediately go to the house of Prince Romo Danovsky.

The embassy officials, realizing their inviolability, "disregarded this rather impudent order. However, an officer set off in pursuit of them, intending to gallop and stop their horse. There were many Danes, Menshikov alone, and the Danes still ran away. I wonder how their fate would have turned out if the Danes were obedient and went to Romodanovsky's house?

As it is easy to understand, there was no "practical state need" for the personal participation of the tsar and his closest henchmen in torture. It is not surprising that Peter wanted to hide this from the Europeans, as they hide through a shameful passion. Peter simply WANTED to torture the hated archers.

It was the same during the mass execution of the archers, who were declared rebels: well, what state necessity was it to admire the whole process - how they were being taken, how they were being torn away from their wives and children, how they were being dragged to the chopping block? On this terrible day, 799 archers were killed; a legend has been preserved that one of the first in the history of the Orlovs, Stepan Orel, rolled back his already severed head with his foot,

134

to go through. And that the tsar liked this gesture to such an extent that he immediately, on the blood-stained square, ordered Stepan Orel to appear at the Preobrazhensky order and become one of his guardsmen. According to another legend, a certain archer pushed the king away: "Step back, sir, this is my place!" According to another version, Peter's archer did not push and said otherwise: "Step back, I'll lie down here!"

In any case, Peter was present on the square from beginning to end and ordered the boyars themselves, to personally participate in the executions. Unaccustomed to executioner positions, the boyars did not really know how to kill a person, and experienced more than understandable moral difficulties (of which there were more, the more there were doubts about the guilt of the archers). As a result, some boyars killed the archer, and then they were taken away from the square by the arms and put to bed. And Dolgoruky hit "his" archer in the middle of the back and chopped him almost in half. Sagittarius



would have endured terrible torments, but Menshikov turned out to be here, he quickly and deftly cut off the head of the archer.

Historians argue, what explains the actions of Peter, what is it: the actions of a not completely sane person or the actions of a tyrant, to whom no one will dare to object anyway? Apparently, both are right. These are the actions of a not quite sane petty tyrant, the development of whose illness was greatly influenced by his very impunity.

And one more thing... Let's remember how Peter got angry at feasts when someone did not share his tastes. How he forced them to drink bottles of olive oil and vinegar. Here it is the same: hating the archers, Peter despotically demanded that all the Moscow boyars share his emotions.

When the patrimarch came to the tortured huts to ask for mercy for the archers, Peter literally threw him out. Several priests were executed only because they prayed for the unfortunate. The wife of a minor official, passing by the corpses of archers hanging on the walls of the Kremlin, threw out: "Who knows if you are to blame?" and crossed herself. The unfortunate woman was denounced, and she and her husband were tortured; their guilt in anything was not proven, but both were expelled from Moscow.

135

Peter wanted the archers to testify against Sophia, so that the escape from the hungry Astrakhan would look like an attempted coup d'état. Of course, soon Romodanovsky brought the necessary "evidence": they say, the archers corresponded with Princess Sophia! Then they took up people close to the queen, including her hay girls. Peter acted as if he were a humanist - he ordered not to whip one of them, who was in the last stages of pregnancy. True, then hang both of them, including the pregnant one. For what? It is not clear ... Sophia's connection with the archers has not been proven, the girls could not participate in the "rebellion" in any way ....

Tellingly, not a single letter from the Streltsy to Sofya and vice versa has ever fallen into the hands of the investigation. A classic story: they say, Peter ordered the three most evil archers to be hung under Sophia's window so that she could see her hanged "supporters" all the time. And he ordered the circle of archers to tie her, Sophia, letters ... All this is true, and this is exactly how everything is depicted in Repin's picture. Only one detail is not true: there was no handwritten letter. It was not Sophia's letter that was fastened to the hands of the archers, but sheets of paper with their testimony about the fact that there was such a letter ...

Just as biasedly cruel was Peter in relation to his mistress Anna Mons. True, she was not tortured, not beaten with a whip and not driven to Siberia or to the chopping block. But stop-

it was hard for Peter to move away from her, and he did not at all limit himself to marital "showdowns" or at least behind-the-scenes scuffles.

Anna Mons was accused in connection with the Prussian envoy Keyserling - it is still not clear whether she was justly accused or falsely accused. There are different versions, up to the fact that, already "resigned" by the king, Anna tried to marry Kaiserling. Considering that in October 1705, when events unfolded, Catherine Skavronskaya already had two children from Peter, this version is very real.

However, even if Anna had "betrayed" the tsar, there would be no corpus delicti in that. But "Monsikha" fell into disgrace along with her sister, since 1704

136

married Balk, and was under house arrest for a long time. At one time she was even forbidden to go to the church. In the Preobrazhensky order, up to 30 people were imprisoned in the "Monsikha case" and sooner or later testified about how Anna Mons abused the tsar's trust. This is not the only example when Peter unconstrainedly extended private interests to the state - he considered them as if they were state interests.

In 1717, after Romodanovsky died, I had to think about another organization of Petrov's beloved offspring, and the patriarchal Preobrazhensky order became cramped. In the years 1721-1726, political affairs were considered in the Secret Chancellery. After the death of the "great reformer", things died down a little, and the Secret Chancellery was dispersed. Anna Ivanovna really needed this kind of institution, from 1731 to 1762 the Office of Secret and Investigative Affairs existed and worked.

These establishments were doing the same thing. And with what terrible ferocity and bloodthirstiness...

On June 27, 1721, the twelfth anniversary of the victory at Poltava was celebrated in St. Petersburg. A certain guy, Maxim Antonov, celebrated this anniversary for a long time. After celebrating, he broke through the ranks of the soldiers and began bowing to Peter from the waist. The guards dragged him away, and Antonov drove into the ear of one of those dragging him away.

Antonov was arrested, tortured until November 1721, once the bones of his hands were crushed in a vice, and sentenced "peasant Nin Maxim Antonov for approaching the high person of His Imperial Majesty in an unusual way, send him to Siberia and be there at the work of the sovereign until his death is inseparable."

In Konotop, a certain soldier offered a toast to the Ukrainians to the health of the "sovereign emperor". The Ukrainian did not yet know

that Peter took the title of emperor, and answered quite faithfully: "The devil knows what kind of emperor this is, I, apart from the sovereign, do not want to know anyone."

'Bushkov A.A. Russia, which was not. M., 1997. S. 373. | 137

They took him to Petersburg in shackles and, although he was not guilty of anything, even in the smallest detail, they beat him with batogs before releasing him. For what?!

Among the victims of the Secret Chancellery, a certain monk did not want to shout "many years" to the new Empress Catherine; the deacon of the Trinity Church in St. Petersburg saw a kikimora and shouted, which has become classic: "To be empty for St. Petersburg!"; a Swede in St. Petersburg predicted the lifespan of people and, among other things, predicted only 3 years for Peter to live (by the way, the prediction came true, Peter really died after 3 years!).

However, examples can be continued ad infinitum; all of them, with a colossal variety of details, will turn out to be disgustingly similar to each other in the main. The total number of political repressed for 36 (in fact - 29) years of Peter's reign amounted to more than 60 thousand people. In this crowd of Old Believers, archers, just careless people, sorcerers are almost invisible. But Peter burned dozens of times more sorcerers than his father!

"... With what motives, for what purposes did the inquisitors go into the most petty, completely childish investigations. These investigations concerned such a case, which to people more or less sensible, and Pyotr Andreyevich Tolstoy and Andrei Ivanovich Ushakov were far from stupid, from the very first time they had to present themselves in their real insignificance. Meanwhile, these naturally intelligent people... are struggling and bustling about, apparently, God knows what. Yes, but this is only apparently: all these orders, diligently carried out, tended towards one thing: to show as much zeal and devotion to his person as possible before the distrustful and suspicious Emperor Peter. Differences, lands, peasant souls were generous rewards for the modest and feasible labors of faithful serfs.

Well! What is the sovereign, such are the lackeys!

During the 26 years of Alexei Mikhailovich's reign, no more than a few hundred people were repressed for "obscene words" or for witchcraft. His reign can be judged

1 Semevsky M.I. The Secret Service of Peter I. Minsk, 1993. S. 284. 138

as you like, but the number of repressed is even less

more than in many German principalities, and, of course, incomparably less than in contemporary Britain during the civil war of 1649. Under him, political investigation was not an exclusively important part of the political system.

And under Peter, he certainly was.

#### PETER'S CARE OF ENLIGHTENMENT. EDUCATIONAL REFORM

With education under Peter the same story as with the fleet. At first glance, everything is correct, he created a whole system of affordable schools, a whole network of educational institutions. In 1701, the School of Navigation was established, and if in full: the School of Mathematical and Navigational Sciences. It was located not just anywhere, but in the building of the Sukharev Tower, and on the top floor there was a real observatory with a telescope. The school was led by such prominent scientists as L.F. Magnitsky, the author of the first Muscovite textbook on mathematics, and A.D. Forvarson, discharged from Scotland.

The training was conducted "in three classes", the youngest of them - mathematical, the senior - navigator. True, they usually sat in each of the classes for several years, and studied not for three years, but most often for 7 or 8.

In 1703 there were 300 teenagers studying at the Navigation School, in 1711 there were already 500. |

On the basis of the Navigation School and its personnel, new specialized schools were created - Engineering, Artillery, Admiralty. Pupils and graduates of the Navigation School were appointed as teachers in digital SCHOOLS.

In 1715, the senior navigational classes were transferred to St. Petersburg, where the Academy of the Naval Guards (Naval Academy) was created on their basis. And the junior classes were closed only in 1752, under Elizabeth.

In general, an idyll, and only if it were not for two circumstances evidence.

139

1. In all the schools founded by Peter, pupils were assigned not of their own free will and not of their parents' will. The children of merchants or wealthy, personally free townspeople found themselves in the best position - they could choose their teaching and freely leave it. And for the children of nobles, it was not about the free expression of will, no! It was about a kind of "educational duty", when the future student has no will

was in sight.

Teaching was a SERVICE. Pupils (even Muscovites) lived in the barracks, and in the classroom there was always a soldier with a stick or a bunch of rods. This soldier did not follow the orders of the teachers at all, but he himself, at his own discretion, could punish the students.

2. As was often the case with Peter's undertakings, the work of the schools had no economic foundation.

In 1711, it got to the point that the students of the Navigation School fled so as not to die of hunger. Catch them with the soldiers, but not all of them were caught; some then "sailed" - in the merchants, in the ranks of the service people, and some of those who fled then, in 1711, disappeared "without a trace." A bad thought involuntarily suggests itself - either the guys died of starvation (remember, Lord ...), or nailed to the robbers (also died, only socially).

In 1714, tearful petitions were again written that the students, having not received a penny for five months, "not only ate their coats, but also walk barefoot, begging at the windows." General-Admiral Apraksin, a person who, so to speak, was vitally interested in the Navigation School, heard: "If there is a school, then money is needed for its maintenance, and if they don't give money, then it's better to dissolve it, because from begging and hunger they come from schoolchildren many wickedness.

At the Academy of the Naval Guards - at the Naval Academy (in St. Petersburg! Under the very eyes of the sovereign!) "Forty-two guardsmen did not go to training because they became naked and barefoot." Already in 1724, Peter arranged a personal audit of the academy - he came to classes. It turned out that 85 students have not been going to classes for 5 months "because they are barefoot and lack food for the day", many

140

some of those who appeared are literally dressed in rags, and some have disappeared for a long time. The authorities and comrades thought that they had gone to beg ...

Those who left to beg, by the way, seriously risked their lives. Yes, life! Escape from training service was punishable by death, and a REQUEST for dismissal from this service was hard labor. Here it makes sense to recall that we are talking about teenagers, many are just children, from 10 to 15 years old.

Parents who would take it into their head to ask for their child to be expelled from school were also referred to hard labor.

The first schools were created at the turn of the 18th and 18th centuries, but only by decrees of February 20 and 28

In 1714, everything finally fell into place: in Moscow, a training service was introduced for the nobles from 10 to 15 years old. The minors were supposed to learn "tsifiri and geometry", and "the fine will be such that they will not be free to marry until they learn this." It was ordered to establish schools in all provinces in bishops' houses and monasteries, and to send there students of mathematical schools from Moscow, established in 1703, as teachers. Each province was assigned two teachers from the students of the mathematical school.

Let's not say that two teachers per province is, in itself, a beggarly little. But it was not easy to fulfill even this decree: until 1723, bishops' schools were "determined" only in Novgorod, and digital schools sat without students, except for Yaroslavl, where 26 people from the children of churchmen were sent to school. In the rest of the numbered schools—in Pskov, Novgorod, Moscow, and Vologda (there were 42 in all in 1723)—teachers sat idle and only ate up their salaries.

After Peter's death, digital schools, introduced in the order of educational service, began to merge with archbishop's, garrison, mining schools and  
gradually disappeared.

The nobles, on the other hand, considered the digital school a terrible burden and tried to hide from it, as much as possible. There was a case when a whole crowd of nobles, not wanting to go digital

141

nuyu school, enrolled in the spiritual Zaikonospasskoe school. The reaction of the tsar is characteristic: he ordered to take all those who signed up for the naval school in St. Petersburg and immediately upon arrival forced them to break piles on the Moika.

General-Admiral Apraksin expressed his protest in a peculiar way. He appeared on the Moika, at the sight of the tsar, he took off his admiral's uniform with the St. Andrew's ribbon and began to diligently drive in piles along with everyone.

- How, Fyodor Matveevich, being an admiral general and a cavalier, but you yourself drive in piles ?!

"Here, sir, all my nephews and grandchildren are driving piles, and what kind of person am I, what advantage do I have in my family ?!

I do not think that the resistance to the digital schools was the resistance to enlightenment as such. The nobles tried to evade the barracks, where a soldier with a stick sits at the door and where they study by force. A person does not like force, what can you do ...

The service nature of noble science is obvious from the decree of October 17, 1723, according to which to keep

grown up in schools after 15 years is not ordered, "even if they themselves wished that, under the name of that science, they would not hide from inspections and definitions for service." Essentially, this is a new type of service, but for children.

However, the service character of science is also visible from the classic stories that served as the plot for *The Pit Captain* and many other works. A completely genuine case is known when, on his return from abroad, Peter demoted a nobleman who did not study well in France to ordinary sailors, and elevated his servant to the nobility, gave him an officer rank and gave the estates of a nobleman to his former serf. Undoubtedly, this is a very edifying story, but it clearly follows from it what any "science" was for Peter - a kind of service, for the performance of which one is rewarded, for failure in which one is punished, as in any other service.

No less original is the creation of the Academy of Sciences. In many states, communities of scientists arose, and it is not very important whether they were called with the loud word "academy". In Britain, the "Royal Scientific

142

society, which united about 300 learned gentlemen, and there was so much sense from this society that the reports of its meetings are still read like fascinating novels.

In the 10th century, academies of sciences began to be created in other countries as well. For example, in France in 1648 there was the Royal Academy of Painting, in 1671 - the Royal Academy of Architecture.

But in Britain, and in France, and in the German principalities, all "academies" were voluntary public associations. The academies were not a place of work, it was impossible to work "at the Academy of Sciences". The scientist was an independent wealthy gentleman who had his own capital and who lived on it, and did science simply because he liked it.

Or the scientist was an official, a doctor, a gymnasium teacher, and, best of all, a university employee. The pinnacle of a scientist's career was the title of professor, and not at all an academician. The most active and gifted scientists were admitted to the academy, membership in the academies was a prestigious and honorable affair, but did not

Chenno.

But in the Russian Empire it was not so. Peter's decree of January 28, 1724 created a new DEPARTMENT with its own staff of officials. One could become an official of the academy after receiving the appropriate education and having a scientific degree... But in the Russian Empire it was impossible to study "to become a scientist"

get a degree. The entire Russian experience of intellectual life—the Slavic-Greek-Russian Academy, the books of learned monks, and the Kiev-Mohyla Academy—all this was declared by the highest authority to be worthless rubbish.

Since there were no scientists in the Russian Empire - officials of the new department, they had to be imported from European countries. They became employees of the Academy of Sciences, which actually opened only at the end of 1725, after the death of Peter. Among the foreigners who came to Russia, there were not so few excellent specialists; as a representative of the scientific class that arose in Russia

143

after Peter, I can only say "thank you" for the material support of such giants as L. Euler or D. Bernoulli. But, of course, if one cares about Russian science itself, the opening of at least one university would have an incomparably greater effect. It is unlikely that the efforts of Russian monks and laity could create a university with more than one faculty - theological. Who prevented the creation of such a university (both Bologna and the Sorbonne began with one faculty...), and then gradually grow other faculties, as was the case in Europe? But Peter chose a different path.

It was assumed, of course, that foreign scientists would gradually develop a Russian replacement for themselves. To do this, a university and a gymnasium were created at the academy, and the academy became a poor copy, almost a parody of European educational institutions.

Not only that, the task of "training personnel" was initially understood as second-rate and secondary. Foreign masters, having received a pension in Russia, were completely happy. Well, who and when else would pay them not for teaching, not for practically useful activities, but for scientific work itself?! They took full advantage of such a great opportunity! In the meantime, the same manners prevailed in the academic gymnasium and the university as in the Navigation School. Unless the soldier with the stick disappeared - he was no longer needed, because Peter's successors no longer wanted to drive in the power of knowledge, but became simply deadly indifferent to the sciences.

An amazing story has been preserved about how Mikhailo Lomonosov returned from Germany and first went to work at the Academic Gymnasium. In a pompous, unheated hall for three hundred students sat a single high school student, crouched from the cold. And the great scientist did not give a lecture. He called the tattered boy to him and asked him: "Have you eaten today?" The schoolboy shook his head, and then Mikhailo Vasilyevich took him to his place for dinner...



And for me they will forever remain a symbol of everything that Peter did for education in Russia: and Lomonosov, who was forced to study in Germany - after all, there was no

144

these universities, what to do... And a hungry boy, tucking his chilled legs to his grumbling belly, in the middle of a marble ceremonial hall decorated with antique busts.

## INNOVATIONS IN THE FIELD OF CULTURE

All Peter's decrees that have at least some relation to culture come down to two options: these or attempts to transfer something to Russian soil that seemed useful to Peter. As an example - the same Lithuanian braids, Dutch-style ships, wide looms ... The list is long, and why?

Or is it a requirement to adopt some form, the appearance of European life. Such are his decrees on barbering, on smoking tobacco, on drinking coffee, on wearing European clothes, on assemblies - that is, on strictly obligatory gatherings with one or another nobleman. All these decrees pursued a clear goal - as quickly as possible outwardly liken Russia to Europe, and the Muscovites to the Dutch.

Peter is especially willingly called a reformer in the field of culture: they say, he allowed to shave beards, learn languages, read European books and thereby began the Europeanization of Russia, put it on the European path again.  
orgy.

There can be no ideas that are further from reality!

Firstly, when Peter was born, he did not "allow" or "permit" anything, he exclusively commanded and ordered.

Secondly, in one respect Peter | did not change anything in any way: under him, society remained, as V.O. Klyuchevsky, "draft". The Russian state was TYAGLOV before Peter and remained so after Peter.

Peter did not even think of changing the tax state or giving "private freedom", his reforms only further divided the "taxable" and "servicemen". Previously, these were different, but parts of one society with one system of concepts and a system of values. Peter ordered the nobility and all "servants" to learn languages, to wear dresses "to the waist"

145

and German camisoles, hang pictures in houses and gather in assemblies. But in the same way, he did not order the peasants, merchants, philistines and Cossacks to do anything like that.

"The people, having stubbornly kept their beard and Russian caftan, were pleased with their victory and looked indifferently at the German way of life of their shaved boyars," wrote A.S. Pushkin.

12 years will pass, and Pushkin, having begun writing The History of Pugachev, will collect such evidence of Pugachev's "indifference" to the lordly way of life that even today, almost 300 years later, it can sometimes be scary to read them. And most importantly, Pushkin is wrong in that, they say, the people persisted and therefore retained "the beard and the Russian caftan." The legendary decree on barbering, issued by Peter after returning from Holland, in 1698, provided for payment of 100 rubles a year from merchants, 60 rubles from boyars, 30 rubles from other townspeople. The one who paid the ransom received a special copper sign, which he wore under his beard. If officials cling to because of the "wrong" appearance, the bearded man lifted his beard, showed a sign.

But here the peasants paid an amount that was completely incomparable: only 1 kopeck when entering the city and when leaving. And in the villages and in small towns, where there were no military teams to let them into the cities and let them out, no one encroached on beards.

And it turns out that the point is not at all in the "stoic" behavior of the peasantry, but in Peter's indifference to his appearance. Or just didn't get it? We have no information about attempts to shave the Cossacks, and the clergy from the very beginning were allowed to "leave" beards. And even more so, no one took away the Russian caftan from the petty bourgeois, merchants and Cossacks.

So even the change of clothes and barbering concerned at most 3% of the population, not to mention the deeper, essential changes in everyday life. Of course, the study of languages, the wearing of short European clothes, and external signs of everyday life such as mirrors, paintings, or ballroom dancing were followed by other changes—often not at all desired by Peter (for example, awareness of oneself as a person,

146

the desire to own private property or protect one's private life from intrusion by the rest of society).

In the XVIII century, Europeanization did not at all mean the development of these external forms of Western life and covered different strata of society. At the turn of the 17th and 18th centuries, any

Europeanization, independent of the state and its efforts, was completely prohibited and everything achieved was destroyed  
Chenot.

Throughout the 17th century, there was a slow Europeanization - first formal, external, then deep; but not at all the Europeanization of the Russian Empire and not of the entire Russian people, but exclusively of the service class, and above all of the nobility.

What exactly did Peter do? With his decrees, he tore the united people into two parts. He ordered one of these parts of the Russian people to outwardly Europeanize (I emphasize - mostly purely outwardly!). The other part of the ti only allowed; third and most - categorically banned.

And in this way, Peter's decrees drove a wedge between two groups of the population: servicemen and tax-payers, residents of several of the largest cities and village people. After Peter, the top servicemen and the taxable bottoms understand each other worse and worse. They have different systems of values and ideas about life, and they are increasingly aware of each other as representatives of almost different peoples.

Most of the forms in which Peter tried to beat the life of the nobility into, survived - after all, they did not prevent the nobility from remaining the same as it was before Peter. It was still the same way that parents conspired with their children without asking their consent, the same way the heads of families decided everything for their relatives, and the same way parents could flog their adult sons to scars, and sometimes even their daughters.

Previously, children were spoken by people in old Moscow clothes, in low wards, fathers and mothers separately. Now people in short coats were talking in the room

147

with pictures and mirrors, drinking coffee and admiring porcelain knick-knacks. Well, what has actually changed?

The only innovation of Peter in the field of culture died with him: immediately after his death, the assemblies disappeared completely.

## CHANGES IN SOCIETY

In an effort to create a new society, Peter acted as abruptly, impatiently, cruelly, as in any other sphere. Take, for example, his decree of March 23, 1714. Very often this decree is interpreted extremely narrowly - as an equalization of the rights of estates and estates. But this is only

a small part of the decree ... And the point is not at all that Peter turned the estates into hereditary estates. The nobility wanted it to be so. Soviet historians wanted the same thing, striving for everything in history to be reduced to the struggle of class forces and for everything in it to be determined by property relations.

But in general, Peter issued a decree on uniform inheritance ... According to this decree, all the property of each nobleman was to be transferred to the eldest son. The main, most valuable property of the nobles was land holdings, but everything was to be transferred to the eldest son: both movable and immovable property. The rest of the landowner's children were called Cadets for some reason and received nothing.

But these "cadets" got rid of compulsory service! They did not have the right to buy estates until they had served seven years ... But they might not have served! The "cadets" were free to choose their occupation - trade, science and art, craft and service in other states. And the state should not have any claims against them and not force them to serve.

It is sometimes said that Peter transferred to Russian soil the laws of majorat—that is, indivisible estates, which were not to be sold and passed into the wrong hands. But the primacy, firstly, included only land holdings, estates! Sir Henry Baskerville was supposed to get the land, but his uncle, if you remember "Soba

148

ku Baskervilles", bequeathed large sums to both his servants and friends and had every right to do so under the then British laws.

Secondly, the eldest son did not necessarily receive the primacy. The owner of the majorate could dispose of it at his own discretion, bequeathing it to the eldest, the youngest, and the middle son. He was not supposed to sell the majorate. If the owner died without a will, the estate passed to the next of kin by the right of seniority.

So the estates did not become a major under Peter, they became something completely different: some kind of "eternally obligated", according to Klyuchevsky, property - that is, property that makes the eldest in the family eternally obliged to serve.

This decree was in flagrant contradiction to the Russian cultural tradition. One can argue whether these are good traditions, whether they are "correct" and whether it is useful to follow them. Perhaps the custom of marjoram does indeed have advantages. But these traditions existed, and people lived in them. The lucky man, who received everything for the investigation, himself felt like a usurper and tried to

at least something to share. All the deprived considered their position the blackest injustice.

Pososhkov describes in detail how the inheritance is crushed to the smallest shares, they reach the point of criminality, "there was no such decree."

Peter himself made a number of reservations, stipulating with the help of new decrees how his decree of March 23, 1714 should be applied. On April 15, 1716, he stipulated that the fourth share of the state should be allocated to the widow - "until the time is right." But such "temporary measures" became more and more numerous. Already after the death of Peter, on May 28, 1725, his widow and heiress issued a decree, which meant the actual deviation from the decisions of Peter.

As in many other cases, the attempt to impose on the Russians life according to strange and alien rules did not lead to anything decisively. A lot of effort, money and time was wasted. In vain, many people experienced inconvenience and suffering.

149

Much more successful was the decision to introduce the famous Table of Ranks. Probably, this next "Peter's creation" turned out to be viable precisely because it corresponded to the spirit of Russian Muscovite society: its ineradicable spirit of service.

There was, of course, another tendency, the aristocratic tendency to determine the "suitability" of a nobleman by his private position. After all, the military board also suggested that Peter determine the nobility of a nobleman by the number of households, that is, by wealth. Approximately in this way, according to the amount of land and serfs, the rank of a nobleman was then determined in most European countries: the medieval principle of the nobility of the clan, belonging to the number of well-known "from antiquity" clans was replaced by the bourgeois principle of wealth.

Characteristic is the answer given to the military college by the convinced statesman Peter: "the noble nobility is worth considering." Not "fitness" according to "nobility", as it was in Muscovy of the 17th century and throughout Europe in the Middle Ages. Unsuitable for wealth, as it became throughout Europe. And nobility according to suitability for service.

And in pre-Petrine Moscow Rus', there were ideas to streamline official ranks, to separate military service from civil service. But, of course, in the performance of Peter, the idea of the Table of Ranks took on special forms.

Firstly, his scrupulous nature, ability and desire to develop everything to the smallest detail came in handy here.

In total, 14 ranks were provided for all state officials. Four columns of ranks were introduced: civil, military, naval, and court ranks. In all columns, the ranks of each rank were equated to each other. Let's say a lieutenant in the naval service, a titular adviser in the civil service, and a staff captain in the military were ranks [X class, with the same salary and the same position. In the same way, a privy councilor in the civil service, a lieutenant-general in the military, a vice-admiral in the navy, and a master of the court in the court were the ranks!] of the class, also with equal pay and equal privileges.

150

To a certain extent, it was a very useful system, because it brought the bureaucratic service to the refined perfection it needed. Similar "tables of ranks" were in Byzantium, where officials were divided into 8 classes, and in China, where there were 18 classes. Attempts to renew it were made in the Russian Federation by introducing a unified tariff scale and state advisers of different classes.

Secondly, Gabel about ranks became (yes, in the feminine gender! Because the word "report card" in the time of Peter was feminine) the only criterion for the "suitability" of a nobleman, the determinant of his position in society.

If an American, meeting with an old acquaintance, looked not at him, but at his car, then a Russian person of the 18th-20th centuries, just as consistently, having met a friend, first of all was interested in his rank. Those who never entered the service were officially called "undergrowth". Prince Gorchakov, who had never served, was "undersized" to the point of gray hair both in the ideas of his society and in official documents. The rank of chamber junker given to Pushkin became a subtle form of insult, because it did not correspond to his years, and the Larins invented by him, who "kept in the life of peaceful signs of sweet antiquity", among all other signs - "... guests were served dishes by rank."

If we recall what great importance was attached to the rank of both the groom and the father of the bride at the conclusion of marriage, during any, the most private, meetings and celebrations, that official newspapers reported on "the arrival and departure from the Capital of persons of the first four ranks ... at one has to admit that the rank was no less, and perhaps even more important in Russian society of the 18th-19th centuries than in the modern USA - wealth.

Thirdly, through the Table of Ranks, for almost two hundred years, the Russian nobility has been replenished. Under Peter, any official of any rank received the rights of personal nobility; the very fact of service made a person the owner of considerable privileges. At the same time, a military man in any rank could transfer

to inherit his position. civil ranks

151

Nick received the rights of hereditary nobility as soon as he reached the rank of UP.

Later, the government repeatedly raised the bar for those who became hereditary nobles, but still their number grew uncontrollably. And the number of those who were in the service grew, had the right to personal nobility, lived according to the same rules and laws (they shaved their beards, drank coffee, taught their daughters to dance, wore European clothes), but had not yet reached the hereditary nobility. At the same time, a word appeared to designate these people, which survived until the 20th century - "raznochintsy".

If we count the raznochintsy with their personal rights, then during the years of Peter's reign (in just 34 years!) The number of nobles increased by about five times.

Of course, in any case, during these two centuries of imperial history, active people would have emerged from the peasant communities, from the small towns of the Russian Empire, and would have occupied a completely different position in the world. But if there were no Tables, they could "go out" to the urban bourgeoisie, to the circle of specialists in "liberal professions" who had nothing to do with the state. But the Russian Empire was conceived and created by Peter in such a way as to preserve the taxable nature of the state as much as possible: at the bottom - taxable; above are servants. Anyone who ceased to be a taxpayer immediately became a serviceman himself ...

So, the Table of Ranks, introduced on January 24, 1722, was a really valuable innovation.

Almost simultaneously with the introduction of the Table, Peter dealt two powerful blows to the Church. Destroyed patriarchate in - one blow. The norm is defined: 1 priest should fall on 150 households of parishioners. Not more!

In 1722, all the "extra" priests were excluded from their class, and those who ended up in the soldiers were still lucky. And the priests who lived on the landlords' land and were excluded from the lists were assigned to the landowners as serfs. That is, since 1722, all the priests of the Russian Empire became either state officials or serfs.

Even earlier, the blow fell on the peasants, serfs and the so-called intermediate strata of society.

152

By decree of 1711, serfs were allowed to

give without land. What used to happen very rarely, as an exception, and was considered an excess, has now become a daily household norm. Previously, a serf was a dependent, but a member of society. He provided with his work the landowner, to whom the land with strong people on this land was given so that he could fully serve. Taking away the estate, they took away and attached

lazy to the ground.

Now the estate and *votchina* became a hereditary type of ownership, and the peasants could be sold regardless of whether the landowner continued to serve. Already under Peter, cases appeared that were completely unthinkable under the first Romanovs: when rich nobles exchanged a serf girl for an overseas curiosity - a parrot taught sailor curses, or separated a family, selling husband, wife and children to different estates. Then it seemed again an extreme, an excess; society got used to it after another generation.

Previously, before the introduction of the poll tax, serfs did not pay the state. Peter made the peasants into the same kind of serfs, and the serfs into the same kind of peasants, paying a soul tax. Before Peter, many Muscovites were both non-servicemen and non-taxable - freemen, church people. Peter destroyed this state of affairs.

Under him, the non-service and non-taxable did not become, everyone became only and exclusively either taxable or service.

The sum of the poll tax itself - 74 kopecks from a landowner's peasant, 1 ruble 24 kopecks from a townsman's or black-mossed peasant - was very well received. simple: by apportioning the cost of the state apparatus and the army to the entire population of the Russian Empire.

We have to admit that Peter made a huge "simplification of society." He simplified relations among the nobility, destroying and mixing different groups of service people, different types of property, reduced the different possibilities of the nobles to one and only one - to service, mainly military.

He destroyed all non-taxable and non-serving strata of society, simply not allowing him to develop relationships without connection.

153

linked with the state—that is, move in the same direction as the rest of Europe.

Just as consistently, he abolished all the diverse forms of subjugation and enslavement of the peasants, and under him a great variety of forms and types of inequality were replaced by much more unambiguous forms of slavery.

He destroyed all kinds of property



in the peasant milieu, preventing the black-haired peasants from generating and developing bourgeois property relations, as happened in the 15th century.

Not only did society become incomparably less free under Peter than it was under Sophia ... It also became less diverse, and this is even worse and more dangerous. After all, the internal diversity of a society is the key to its possible development... The more complex, diverse a society, the more different people it is, the easier such a society responds to the challenges of the time, moves forward, improves. And the simpler it is, the more difficult it is for society to adapt to a changing life.

Under Alexei Mikhailovich, even under Mikhail Fedorovich, society was freer and more diverse than under Peter. That is, at that time Muscovy was closer to the European model of society and could develop more easily and quickly.  
to be.

And someone else calls what Peter did "progress"?!

## FOREIGNERS

Another classic tale is about Peter attracting an incredible number of foreigners. The facts testify against this judgment, because by the time of Peter's accession to the throne in the Kuku settlement in Moscow, more than 20 thousand people already lived, and during the entire period of his reign no more than 8 thousand entered the Russian Empire. A lot, but no revolution. Judging by the trends of the times of Alexei Mikhailovich and Fyodor Alekseevich, one could expect a much larger influx of foreigners. Moreover, all the restrictive restrictions

154

previous years - such as living in Kukui, legal inequality with the Orthodox - Peter just canceled.

Why foreigners were not so eager to enter the empire of Peter becomes clear from a pamphlet published in 1704 by Martin Neugebauer, a former officer in the Muscovite army and close associate of the tsar. The pamphlet was solemnly titled: "A letter from a noble German officer to the Privy Councilor of a high ruler, about the mistreatment of foreign officers whom the Muscovites recruit into their service."

In it, Neugebauer wrote that foreign officers in Muscovy were beaten in the face, flogged with sticks and whips.

Colonel Strasberg was beaten by the city voivode with a bato-

gami only because he did not want to disobey the royal decree.

Colonel Bodivin was executed only because his servant stabbed the royal favourite, the paramedic, with a sword.

The tsar personally beat Major Kirchen in the face, spat on him, only because he, having served as a major for a year, did not want to become a captain, giving way to a certain Russian.

All the property of Franz Lefort was taken to the treasury, leaving to the heirs only the debts of the deceased.

It is difficult to say to what extent this pamphlet can be trusted. Neugebauer himself was dismissed from the Muscovite army because he scolded the Russians as barbarians and dogs and arrogantly lectured the courtiers because they did not properly educate Tsarevich Alexei.

Among Peter's German allies, in Prussia and Saxony, writings offensive to Muscovy were banned, but here, most likely, the point was precisely in allied relations, and not in the zeal for justice.

The reaction of the Muscovites is characteristic: in 1705, a "serving foreigner", a certain Huissen, was sent to Germany with a refutation: "A lengthy denunciation of a criminal and slanderous libel filled with slander, which in a few years was published under the title "Letter from a noble German officer to a secret adviser to a high ruler, about the mistreatment of foreign officers whom the Muscovites recruit into their service.

155

In this essay, Neugebauer was called "archishel mine" and other strong words, his character and behavior in Muscovy were painted in the blackest colors, up to accusations of treason, theft, and so on. In essence, the accusations thrown by Martin Neugebauer are not refuted, but only told that those offended in Muscovy are themselves to blame for such treatment.

Neugebauer replies in a completely disgusting spirit - that Huissen himself is a thief and got a place through the mediation of Menshikov's mistress ... But this "polemic" is of little interest to us.

For attempts to understand what is happening, this detail is incomparably more important - an attempt not to refute that someone was executed, but someone was spit in the face, but to "direct arrows" at the offended themselves is very suspicious. You involuntarily come to the conclusion that Neugebauer's accusations could have been justified ... Moreover, if he lied, there is nothing easier - to arrange a tour of Germany and Major Kirk-

chen, and Colonel Strassberg, and even more so the "deceased nickname" Bodivin - let them drink in all taverns, speak at all officer and noble meetings in all principalities and with such a pleasant service prove the falsity of Neugebauer's inventions ... However, this was not done, and here too there are questions.

Moreover, the position of foreigners under Peter really changed. Before Peter, all internal "showdowns" between foreigners were not subject to the Muscovite court. This decision may not be ideal from the point of view of jurisprudence, but it is very convenient for foreigners themselves. Under Peter, foreign servicemen are more and more subject to the laws of Muscovy itself. Everything would be fine, but only the legal practice of Muscovy is very different from European, and this causes complications ... Today, almost dissertations are being written, aimed at proving that Muscovy was not at all backward and what can be said about its lagging behind Europe only utterly corrupted people. But serving foreigners did not read these writings and stubbornly considered the laws of Muscovy to be rude.

and cruel.

156

You can condemn the custom of duels as much as you like, but, in any case, according to it, people met in a duel according to the laws of knightly honor. Again, all talk about chivalry and the very honor of the purest water can be considered hypocrisy - a personal matter. But the Europeans did not think so, and they did not like the categorical ban imposed on dueling by Peter in 1702.

And even more I didn't like that for entering a duel, regardless of its results, the death penalty was due, and for the mere exposure of a weapon - cutting off the right hand.

During the years of Peter the Great, the legislation provided for the death penalty in 90 articles (under Alexei Mikhailovich, 60 articles), but here people were doomed to death and mutilation by royal decree, which had nothing to do with the law. For some reason, the Europeans didn't like this, as well as the right of any boss to beat them with batogs and the king's "right" to spit in their faces and beat them.

Was it the same everywhere? Maybe, but for some reason the foreign officers thought differently and were in no hurry to serve Peter.

And besides the number of serving foreigners, their quality has also changed. If among the foreigners who entered Muscovy under Alexei Mikhailovich there were many cultured and intelligent people, and many of them gave rise to intelligent Russian surnames, then not a single foreigner is known who came to Muscovy under Peter and became the founder of a cultured, well-known Russian

families. No one. Such foreigners will not appear under Catherine... But by that time, the country's legislation will also become different; and for the Russian nobility there will also be other rules of life, not very different from the rules of life in Europe.

In the meantime, mainly two kinds of people go to Muscovy: wild creatures who have nothing against the risk of receiving a portion of batogs or spitting in a sleeping physiognomy. Or those who especially have nowhere to run: you can go to the colonies, across the ocean, you can go to Muscovy. It is better in the colony, because in America and India there are more chances

157

grow rich; but in the colonies Europeans die like flies in autumn, while in Muscovy the climate is better and more familiar.

I hope there is no need to prove that not every person would voluntarily participate in the gatherings of the most drunken council. Foreigners, by the way, had the opportunity not to participate! When Johann Korb did not want to accept Nikita Zotov's "blessings" with crossed pipes, he left. But behind Yakov Turgenev's carriage were both "kings" - Buturlin and Romodanovsky, and with them - Lefort, Gordon, Timmerman, Pamburg, up to ten foreign colonels: foreigners who exchanged the remnants of honor for the mercy of Tsar Peter.

Among the foreign servants of Peter, there is a huge percentage of dzhentimen, for whom a rope or a strong casemate with bars on the windows cried. At least three times he elevated frank pirates to admirals, and the general "lack of personnel" brought to the point that Duke Ogilvy, near Narva in 1700, shamefully defected to the Swedes with all his staff, Peter again accepted into the service and finally parted with him only in 1706, when the stupidity of Ogilvy exceeded all conceivable limits.

## ECONOMY

Many historians seriously believe that if before Peter there were only 30 manufactories in Muscovy, and under him there were 240, then the Russian economy became stronger by the same number ... But this is a serious mistake.

The fact is that, starting from the last years of the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich, a MARKET economy developed in Muscovy. The state could help breeders, give them loans, provide benefits, but tried to support production, built on free labor and capable of throwing products on the market. Very often the government chose from whom to buy the products it needed; it is private production

vodstvo created the material base of the army in the 1670s. These enterprises helped win the war with Turkey in 1676-1681.

158

Peter acted in a completely, fundamentally different way. If he gave benefits, then in such a way as to exclude any competition between the owners of enterprises. If he gave contracts, then "his own". In the best traditions of the Soviet "cost economy", merchants spent huge amounts of money to "cajole" officials, to obtain maximum benefits and privileges: this turned out to be incomparably more profitable than throwing a competitive product on the market.

At the same time, the impudence of the contractor and, accordingly, his ability to extract income was in the most direct connection with his proximity to the king. Menshikov took a contract to create a canal from the Volkhov to the Neva - strong, sudden winds often flew outside the calm Lake Ladoga, in a matter of minutes they raised a wave up to 5-6 meters high. Many barges perished, and among the people the conceived canal was even affectionately called the "Neva Canal". So the canal itself was needed, but the method of its creation turned out to be impossibly original: 7,000 people died on construction from starvation and unbearable living conditions, 2 million rubles allocated from the treasury disappeared no one knows where, and the canal Peter's life was never built.

Now the construction of a canal from the Volga to the Don has been completely forgotten, with the same monstrous result in the form of a huge number of dead people.

Perhaps the construction of the port in Taganrog and Volgo-Don was forgotten because after the Prut campaign of 1711, these unfinished structures had to be abandoned.

Just as well forgotten is the attempt to build a huge port at Rogervik, a few miles from Reval. As often happened, Peter did not want to use the already existing (in this case, the already built port of Reval) and, with maniacal persistence, built something that he alone would have to do with. But for some time he hesitated whether to build a sea "paradise" in St. Petersburg or in Rogervik. Everyone had a raid in Rogervik ho Rosh, only open to the westerly winds, and winter storms ruined ships every winter.

159

"They brought an incredible amount of logs, devastated the forests of Livonia and Estonia, made huge boxes

and, having filled them with cobblestone, they lowered them to the deep bottom of the raid; but the storm scattered the building. The work was repeated, but with the same failure, so that, finally, the terribly expensive business was abandoned. Many workers also died on Rogervik.

All these are examples not only of the monstrous extravagance of the state of Peter - extravagance both in material resources and in human lives.

But these are also examples of the ugly organization of the state economy. All these "buildings of the century", so to speak, "White Sea Canal XU! century", organized by contractors. And where tens of thousands died, tens (already without "thousands"! just tens!) of people made quite decent fortunes.

At the same time, it was impossible to get rich by organizing the production of goods for the market under Peter - a greedy pack of officials would instantly rob an entrepreneur who was not connected with the state. And the impoverished, half-starved population needed absolutely everything, but very little could buy. In the jargon of economists, this is called beautifully: "deficit of effective demand." And it turns out that the state simply corrupted the merchants, making serious production unprofitable and profitable "savings", leading to mass mortality.

In addition to organizing several "constructions of death", Peter "became famous" for the widest distribution of slave labor in industry and even in trade.

A true case is known when the state, having built linen factories for the production of canvas, decided to "give them to merchants, but if they don't want to, even if they don't want to." The term "serf merchants" or "serf capitalists" sounds surreal, but that's how it was. Peter could not

1 Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 2. Rostov-on-Don, 2000. S. 574.

160

to want that in his state at least someone remains free, even if he is an entrepreneur.

In trade, trading "kumpans", that is, companies, were also forcibly created. The first "Kumpanstva" were not trading at all... They were associations of subjects, each of which had to build a multi-gun ship at its own expense...

But then Peter also issued decrees about the trade in "kumpanstvo", and that Russian merchants would carry that

vars in chnemetchina. The Dutch were even frightened at one time and wanted to put pressure on Peter - let him not order his "Kumpans" to carry goods to Holland ...

But after a very short time, the resident of the Netherlands states, Von der Gulst, reported: "As for the trade in companies, this business fell by itself; Russians do not know how to take on and start such a complex and difficult business. I asked before that instructions be given to me in this regard, but if I now receive this instruction, I will slow down its execution, because at your request the tsar will destroy the matter, which has already been recognized as impossible, and will show that he did it for you".

True, there were also family artels, and they were somehow viable ... but Peter, of course, banned them. If the Bazhenins could get to Holland on their ship with the "robots", then they could, of course, bring goods too ... the same canvas. But by that time, the production of canvases had already been ruined by Peter's decrees, there was simply nothing to take abroad, and the Bazhenins did not know how to trade in "kumpans" and let them go abroad.

it is forbidden...

In the entire history of the time of Peter the Great, only twice did Russian merchants break out abroad with goods ... it would be better if they did not do this! We know about one such attempt to trade in Stockholm in some detail from the denunciation of the Russian envoy Bestuzhev: "Russian merchants do not show any respect, they constantly quarrel and fight among themselves, which causes considerable dishonor to the Russian people. And although I decreed to them from Your Majesty that they should live peacefully and keep themselves clean in clothes, but they not only clean themselves in clothes

161

they do, but some of them walk around in an old Russian dress without a tie, and some of them also walk the streets with beards.

The fact is that the "merchants" brought to Sweden not anything but roasted nuts and wooden spoons. In order to save money, they didn't go to the hotel, so they cooked porridge on a fire, on the shore, gathering crowds of curious people, and then they rode a sleigh (in the month of August) around the city and cut their throats: "Who needs nuts?! Who wants a spoon?!" And they yelled exclusively in Russian ...

I won't argue whether they were just vagabonds who stole the ship and pretended to be merchants, or whether the merchants were brought to such a state. Importantly, there were no other cases of trade in finished goods at all.

If this is how entrepreneurs were treated, then even more so the workers at all, without exception, manufactories under Peter became disenfranchised slaves. Gone in the past

times when the kings allowed to recruit "all sorts of people out of kindness, and not into bondage." Yes, and there were no people in Muscovy who do not drag out either service or taxes - just those who could most easily be hired as workers or become a foreman or engineer, that is, a specialist.

Now these people were not at all attracted by "good", but were "sent to work forever." The "walking man," already psychologically, perhaps, ready to become a factory worker, became a slave at the same factory ... The peasants, who had fled from the landlords, found refuge in the factories, under Peter it was forbidden to return them ... At the cost of losing that the very freedom they sought when they became workers.

To provide the factories with labor power, Peter gave villages and entire volosts to the factory peasants - calling a spade a spade, to serf slaves. Since 1721, even non-nobles had the right to buy villages to provide factories with labor.

Walking people fled from factories to the Don and the North, slaughtered craftsmen, broke cars and set fire to factories. The peasants assigned to the factories chopped off their arms and legs for themselves and their children so as not to go to the factory. They were caught, beaten with a whip, exiled, branded, shackled,

162

shawls to intimidate others. The gallows with corpses in varying degrees of decay has become a common part of the landscape of factories and manufactories (as well as the "construction sites of the century", of course). The workers in Voronezh, when asked by the tsar, what, they say, would be wishes, asked one thing: to remove the corpses from the gallows. "And how the wind is from that side, and a piece does not climb into the throat."

Already after Peter, his niece and in many ways the successor of his work, Anna Ivanovna, in 1736 declared all workers in general at all enterprises of the Russian Empire assigned to the manufacturers "on

forever and with offspring.

All this had two consequences: the development of the Russian working class, free artisans, generally personally free people, was suppressed, and one of the "islands of freedom", which were many in the 10th century, disappeared.

And secondly, such an industry was doomed to lag behind. This had an effect already during the life of Peter, and just in those areas of production that he considered priority. In 1690, not having time to put his sister on the throne, Lev Kirillovich Naryshkin "grabbed" no less than 8 Kashira factories. Their rightful owner, Andrey Marselius, died a natural death, everything is clean here, the factories went to the treasury, but the question is - why should it be Kot Kirillovich who profited from them? Only because the queen's brother.



And Lev Kirillovich ruined these factories so much that in 1720, out of 8 factories, not on paper, but in reality, only two existed, and from these two, all qualified people fled long ago. In 1720, the factories of Alexander Lvovich Naryshkin, the son and heir of Kot Kirillovich, Peter's maternal uncle, produced, with 1,160 people working, 15,000 fuses, 4,000 pistols, 12,000 swords.

In the 1670s, private factories produced five times as much output. As early as 1646, Muscovy was selling gun barrels! Now it's not like that...

But this is all just the beginning. While the state, exterminating its own people, squandering subsoil and forests, somehow keeps such obviously inefficient, unprofitable production afloat, everything can still somehow exist.

163

to go. But now Peter is dying, and his heirs have neither the means nor the special desire to finance at any cost his toys in the form of a fleet or useless production. And a long, painful agony begins...

How many enthusiastic cries were emitted by lovers of "jumping from the first month of pregnancy to the ninth" about the Ural factories! Here, they say, according to the iron will of Peter and the genius of Demidov, factories were created in the wilderness, among complete desertion, and these factories supplied almost all of Europe with iron!

That's right - cast iron ... Moreover, low quality cast iron, which foreigners bought as raw materials and immediately melted down. In fact, Demidov's factories produced raw materials that were convenient for transportation, and not finished products at all; they enriched the ore, turned it into bad pig iron and transported it to the other end of Europe, to Sheffield or Edinburgh. There, pig iron was turned into steel, everything that was made from classy iron was made from it, and sold ... including to the Russian Empire.

And where are the Russian craftsmen who made steel in Tula, Serpukhovei Kashira back in the 1640s-1650s?! I think it would be nice to look for these craftsmen in those mass graves where the builders of Taganrog, Volgodon, Rogervik, and the Nevsky Canal were buried. And the survivors had neither the time, nor the strength, nor the right to do what they know how to do. Muscovy of the first Romanovs brought up these masters; The Russian Empire of Peter the Great destroyed them.

How are we progressing, gentlemen?!

In general, there is nothing further from reality than S.M. Solovyov: "Internal

security and external security through a well-organized army and the enrichment of the country through trade - these are the two goals of Peter, as he vividly expressed in his famous manifesto on the call of foreigners in April 1702.

In January 1704, however, a decree broke out on the construction of stone houses in Moscow, with a facade not on the courtyard,

| Massey R. Peter the Great. T. 1-3. Smolensk, 1996. S. 75. 164

but on the street. Those who could not build such a house had to sell their plot of land. The number of houses built according to this decree is also known - "more than a hundred." Let me remind you that under Sophia and Golitsyn, more than three thousand stone houses were built in Moscow - without any decrees or other administrative delights.

Need comments?

## REFORM MEANS

Much and convincingly was written about the ruin of the country under Peter. Known figure, called P.N. Milyukov: they say that by 1710, 20% of the taxable population of Muscovy had disappeared. It is interesting that before him an even more terrible figure was called - 25%, so P.N. Miliukov somewhat softened the figures given by the science of his time. Moreover, Pavel Nikolayevich believed that not all of these 20% died - at least a third of those who were missing - they were simply fugitives or went into robbers.

The number of robbers under Peter really exceeds all imagination. Robber gangs controlled decent chunks of the territory of the Russian Empire - entire volosts and provinces. They ran a good economy, and some chieftains led hundreds and thousands of people into battle, and the idea is lost in general, where are the bandit shiins here, and where are the rebel armies ... The line is very unsteady.

In the Oryol province, the robbers built a military-style fortification and served no worse than the "amusing" ones. In Likhvinsky district, the robber Sirotka (name and surname unknown) dressed his gang in military uniforms, and kept a guard of honor with rifles and swords.

Near Voronezh, the "robbers" who fled from work beat three field guns from the guards and famously fired from them at the troops who came to "take them into captivity". Later, THESE "robbers", according to some sources, joined the Don Cossacks, according to others, they disappeared in an unknown direction: either they dispersed in small groups around the country, or collectively moved to seek a better life among the Bashkirs, in Siberia,

ato and in the steppes of present-day Kazakhstan, among the Horde.

165

The country was being ruined, but Peter always lacked money, starting from the unforgettable times of the Kozhukhovsky campaign and the "capital city of Preshburg". There was a case when Peter, in order to send another handout to the Saxon elector Augustus, who became the Polish king, took cash from several offices (including private ones), borrowed money from the Trinity Monastery, from the merchant Filantiev (whether he gave it away, history is silent) , and borrowed the last 420 gold coins from Menshikov (I definitely didn't give these away).

One of the reasons for the eternal lack of money is the monstrous extravagance of Peter. He always spent several times more than was necessary, and always collected more than he spent on the cause. The same story with the bells from which it was supposed to make cannons: after all, no more than 10% of the torn off bells went into action.

I don't know if this has anything to do with the economy, but what Peter was absolutely virtuoso in was squeezing money out of his own people.

I have already written about the amazing service of the fiscals, who took half of what they "found" for themselves. And the "profit-makers" introduced much earlier competed with the fiscals. It was their completely official service - to find absolutely everything that could bring income to the state. They searched, including introducing new taxes. Under Peter, the tax burden increased, according to some data, five times, according to others - even five and a half.

The taxes introduced by Peter can be listed for a very long time, to name just a few: on cucumbers, on watermelons, on coffins, on drinking water, on marriage, on birth, on funerals, on wheat, on candles, on owning a horse, and on the right to skinning your own dead horse, to buy a bed, for firewood, for a stove with a chimney, for ... however, I think that's enough!

Under Peter, a subject literally could do nothing without paying at least some tax.

And to whom - also "state monopolies", when only the state had the right to sell some kind of var. These goods included resin, tar, fish, alcohol, oil, chalk, linen, furs, and tobacco. Salt was sold

166

twice as expensive, and people who were "poor," according to Pososhkov, "scurried and died" when they could not pay for

salt is such money.

Profit-makers came up with the most fantastic, sometimes completely unbelievable ways to replenish the treasury. The famous profit-maker Andrey Kuragin made a discovery that was destined to survive both Kuraev, and Peter himself, and the whole era...

They talk romantically about how this discovery was made... Like, a certain man approached Peter right on the street, but when the tsar looked at him, he got frightened and ran away. Peter ordered to bring a folder that a stranger had dropped right into the dirt of the street, read it ... and ordered that the author of this document be brought to him at any cost! And when they brought him, he treated Andrey Kuragin kindly and made him the head of the profiteers ...

The idea was this: from that day on, all transactions in Moscow are made only on the so-called stamped paper, that is, paper with watermarks and with a stamp in the form of the state emblem: the two-headed eagle of Roma new. Paper of different quality and, accordingly, different cost. If the transaction is up to ten rubles, then the paper is worth a penny. If the transaction is for a large amount, the price of the paper also increases, up to 10 rubles for a transaction worth five thousand or more. And if the merchants conclude a deal not on stamped paper, then the deal is declared invalid! So they will pay, they will not go anywhere!

In addition, all petitions, all official requests of a person to power must also be made on stamped paper! The bigger the deal, the more expensive the paper should be. If a poor soldier's widow asks to be sent to a digital school at state expense, let her pay a kopeck for the simplest sheet of paper, where the coat of arms looks like a fake, so carried around, not clear. And if the future owner of a thousand souls enters into inheritance rights, let him buy a sheet of stamped paper for 10 rubles at a price - dense, white, with a gold edge on the left edge.

167

The stamp paper survived until 1917! This is one of the few inventions of Peter, along with the Table of Ranks, which has lived for so long.

PRICE OF WORSE-REFORM

So, the price: decrease in population by at least a quarter.

The division of the nation into two subcultures, two sub-ethnoses and almost two different peoples.

The rise of slavery. Disappearance of free people. The transformation into "cogs", in essence, of the entire population. A decrease in people's freedom, and with it, a reduction in the prospects for development.

Lumpenization, impoverishment of the main part of the population and even the nobility. Turning into fugitives almost 30-40% and robbers almost 5-6% of the entire male population. Corruption of people by cruelty, meanness, the profitability of complicity in the murders of their own fellow citizens, the futility of honest labor.

I'm afraid that many Russians of the late 20th – early 20th] centuries haven't quite got it yet — in addition to the Troubles of the early 15th century, 1605-1613, there was also the Troubles of the early 16th century! century, the time of Peter I. The turmoil, perhaps less terrible, but with the same consequences: the split of the people, the rupture of ties, the decrease in the population by almost a third, and most importantly, the triumph of complete uncertainty in everything related to the future fate and further structure of the state. .

Or perhaps the worst thing is the colossal corruption of the people... again, not the entire people, of course, but precisely that part of it that interacted most closely with Peter, depended on Peter, became both out of official necessity and out of instinct of self-preservation as a blind tool for the fulfillment of his sovereign will. Corruption of those same ruling 1%, at most 2-3% of the population of the Russian Empire.

And all this for the sake of the Table of Ranks, the stamped paper, the renaming of the Boyar Duma into the "conziliya" or into the Senate and the governors into the general?!

## Part II

### GENERATIONS OF THE ANTICHRIST

#### Chapter 1 THE ANTICHRIST ON THE THRONE

... Killed a lot of people because he was very brilliant.

Count L.N. Tolstoy

#### THE ANTICHRIST AT ALL.

What's the matter?! What happened in Rus' at the end of the 17th century - the beginning of the FUCK century?! Or, to put it more

vychno: who is to blame?!

The simplest thing here is to blame Peter personally |. They say, if not an impudent boy, but a positive elderly Vasily Golitsyn, a protege of the Miloslavskys and a lover of Princess Sophia, came to power, there would be neither the horrors of the Petrine era, nor the split of the nation into almost two peoples, nor all sorts of psychological tensions, dragging on without small two centuries.

A more refined point of view suggests that traitorous nobles are to blame for everything, who began to Europeanize and thereby severed ties with the rest of the people. These nobles began to treat the "people" with arrogance, and this is the root of all Russian troubles for whole centuries.

There is also a point of view that provides for an even more numerous category of "culprits". This is - well, of course! - Europeans, primarily Germans. They forced Rus' to accept the norms of their civilization - either by drinking Peter, or by bribing all the highest dignitaries,

171

sending "agents of influence". In them, evil foreigners, the root of evil, they are the culprits of all Russian troubles and strife.

Jews, most often, are not named as the culprits - it is too obvious that they did not play any role either in Russian or in European politics at that time. But I am ready to give everyone who wants about forty or fifty fascinating versions, according to which Chechens, Armenians, maharishi-boddi satvas, buffoons who survived in the dense forests and representatives of the oceanic super-civilization, whose distant and degraded descendants are dolphins, are among the culprits.

You can frolic in search of the culprits and conspirators for a long time, and even longer you can frolic about people's stupidity and ignorance. The trouble is that many aspects of events remain hidden from us even today. And not because we don't know something, but primarily because we simply don't know how to see them and understand them correctly. In history (and not only in history) we very often see an event, but we are completely unable to understand why it happened, what is the essence of the phenomenon and what each participant in the events can expect from it.

Events such as the church schism, Peter's revolution, Alexander's coup, the revolution and the Civil War of 1917-1920 determined the fate of literally millions of people who became their contemporaries. Many of them would give several years of their lives in order to understand what is happening around?! Where does it all go, how can it end and what can be done to

their salvation and for the salvation of their loved ones. Lacking the knowledge that people would have decades or even centuries later, they created those explanations of what was happening for which they had the intelligence, knowledge and insight.  
value.

Of course, many of the explanations for the Peter the Great coup were neither stupid nor naive, but it was only in the very last decades that a scientific theory appeared explaining why such strange premises entered the foundation of the St. Petersburg period of our history.

172

And showing in a completely new light a lot of what happened at the time of the Petrine coup,

I will introduce the reader to the theory developed by the Russian scientists Yu.M. Lotman and B.A. Uspensky!; without knowledge of this theory, our understanding of the Petrine era may be incomplete. But remember: I am not presenting mud in the last resort, but "only" a scientific hypothesis, which may also be incorrect.

... The Christian Church saw the world as a clash of good and evil forces. There was nothing in the world that for her would not be either righteous or sinful. Any decision of the emperors, any phenomenon in nature was either good, holy, or bad, sinful. Animals, minerals, stars, peoples and individuals were rigidly divided into "positive" and "negative", saints and sinners.

In the 11th century, Catholics recognized the existence of heaven, hell, and purgatory—a special place where souls go through the redemption of petty, non-mortal sins and then end up in heaven. In Western Christianity, the concept of the neutral appeared - about persons, phenomena and actions that are not sinful and not righteous. And as long as the sphere of the sinful and the holy was not touched upon, Western society could change without questioning its most important values. Having learned from the Arabs how to make paper and create a mining industry, Western Christians neither sinned nor approached holiness.

Eastern Christianity continued to live in a world where there was nothing neutral - nothing that was neither sinful nor righteous. Thanks to this, Byzantine scholars established themselves as the most incredible moralists, spending a lot of time explaining how blessed are, say, birds that peck insects in gardens, how great is the Lord who created these birds, how useful they are for humans, and in general how good that they are. For them, it was important not only, but often and not so much

Russian culture (until the end of the 17th century) // Uspensky B.A. Selected works. T. 1. M., 1996. S. 338-380.

173

facts, how much their religious and moralistic interpretation  
ing.

Rusiv XI, and in the XV centuries, in the view of Russians, remained a holy land, in which everything was absolutely sacred and righteous. Any little thing, including the custom of making bows from the waist, sleeping after dinner, or sitting on a bench, and not on a chair, was a sacred custom. To depart from it meant, to some extent, to depart from Christianity. Naturally, no changes could be made to these sacred settings. On

to start plowing the earth differently or forging metal did not mean

simply to depart from the precepts of the ancestors, but also to doubt the grace of Holy Rus'.

All other countries, both eastern and western, were regarded as sinful, having fallen away from the true faith. Of course, the Russian tsars organized new industries, started "regiments of the new system" and, hiring German and Scottish engineers and officers, placed them above the Russian workers and soldiers - simply because they possessed knowledge that the Russians did not yet have. But even at the end of the XNUMXst century, touching a "foreigner" was disgusting; it was forbidden from a religious point of view to enter his house and eat his food. The Germans remained those who are used, but from whom they hardly learn. Russian society furiously resisted any attempts to change it even a little.

In the debate about the reforms of Peter I, about the entire Peter's era, it is quite rightly noted that Russia had to learn from Europe and become Europe itself - if it did not want to turn into a semi-colony and perish in the historical sense. But one most important fact is not taken into account at all: in order to learn from Europe, it was necessary to destroy the idea of the countries of "Latinism" as sinful countries, religiously lost lands. At the same time, it was necessary to destroy the idea of Russia as a perfect country in which everything is sacred and nothing can be changed.

Peter acted in the same way as Prince Vladimir acted a millennium before him: he forced him to accept a new system of values! Vladimir "turned" the idea

174

ancient Russians: he declared his native paganism a sign of savagery, and faith in Perun and Mokosh - an incorrect belief in demons. And someone else's faith, the faith of enemies, the Byzantines,



Tsev, whose temples it was so fun to rob, declared the true faith, which you like it or not, but now you have to accept.

Peter 1 also turned everything upside down: he declared Holy Rus' backward and wild, imperfect and rude. Sinful Western countries, inhabited almost by demons, declared civilized and enlightened, a source of knowledge and culture. In such an inverted system of values, it turned out by itself that sinful, insignificant Rus' was simply obliged to adopt wisdom from the righteous scientist of the West. Now it is German clothes that are worn everyday by shaven nobles, but at the wedding of bearded jesters they are dressed in Russian folk clothes, and in the gymnasiums of the 17th century, lazy people and losers will be forced to wear Russian clothes. PUNISHMENT - as a century earlier they put on German.

Peter [and did not even think of canceling the opposition between Russia and the West, which had long existed in the minds of Russia; he only reversed the signs. What was with a plus sign began to be perceived with a minus sign, and vice versa.

Moreover...

Peter marries Ekaterina Skavronskaya, whose godfather, when rebaptized into Orthodoxy, was his son Alexei (that's why she became "Alekseevna"). And it turned out that he would marry not only a public girl, but also his spiritual granddaughter ...

Peter | appropriated the title "father of the fatherland", and in the religious tradition, only a clergyman can be a "father", and only the head of the entire Russian Orthodox Church can be "father of the fatherland".

Peter | allowed to call himself "God" and "Christ", he was constantly referred to by words from the Holy Scriptures and church hymns, which, in fact, refer only to Christ. So Feofan Prokopovich greeted Peter, who appeared at the feast, with the words of the troparion: "Behold the Bridegroom is coming at midnight," and after the Battle of Poltava

175

On December 21, 1709, Peter was greeted with the words of church singing addressed to Christ on Palm Sunday: ""Blessed is he who comes in the name of SON hosanna in the highest, God the Lord and appear to us ..

The rebellious archers were tortured and executed with such truly satanic cruelty that some questions involuntarily arose... And who, with such rapture, almost with satanic laughter, exterminates the Orthodox, frankly enjoying their torment?!

Priests from the rebellious archery regiments were hanged on a special gallows in the form of a cross, and they were hanged by an executioner dressed as a priest. The execution turned into a mockery of the Christian faith itself, blasphemy, Satan

skim giggle.

Peter [founded the All-Joking and All-Drunken Cathedral, which could only be perceived as a blasphemous and, moreover, public mockery of the church and church service.

It came to amazing coincidences, the randomness of which I leave to the reader to judge ...

The coming of the Antichrist was expected in 1666, and when it was not fulfilled, they began to consider 1666 not from the birth of Christ, but from his resurrection, that is, in 1699. A few days before the start of this year, on August 25, 1698 (it should be remembered that the year began on September 1), Peter returned from his trip abroad, and his return was immediately marked by a whole series of blasphemous transformations: the struggle with Russian national clothes, with beards, transferring the celebration of the New Year to January 1 (as in unrighteous Western countries).

It was no coincidence that at that time ridiculous, but natural rumors began to spread - that the Germans replaced the real Peter abroad, "put him in Stekoln (in Stockholm. - A.B.) in a stake", and it was not Peter who returned to Rus' at all, but a German changeling, not a man, a non-human ...

It turned out that Peter fit perfectly into the image of the Antichrist and, in fact, had nothing against this image. And really, did Peter not know how to perceive

176

are these actions of his? Surely he just couldn't not to know this.

Many of Peter's actions could not be perceived otherwise! By his actions, Peter proclaimed that he was the Antichrist, just as surely as if he had declared it himself!

Did he understand who, according to the ideas of his subjects, had smoke coming out of his mouth and nose, when he walked through the streets of Moscow with a smoking pipe?

If Peter walked through the streets of Mosnva and shouted loudly: "I am the Antichrist!" - and then the effect would be no more.

Yes, both the officers themselves and the soldiers - in foreign-style uniforms, with shaved faces ... After all, the demons on the icons were depicted as shaved and in German frock coats and caftans! So when the soldiers (and even under the command

a German officer) was dragged into the Preobrazhensky order of that bearded Old Believer dressed in Russian, at the semantic level it could only be perceived as follows: demons are dragging a Christian to the underworld. After all, the monstrous cruelty of the investigation, torture by fire were everyday, everyday practice. Without any particular strain of fantasy, contemporaries could imagine the dungeons of the Preobrazhensky Prikaz as a kind of earthly branch of hell into which the Orthodox are plunged by demons, and for what?! For the Christian faith...

A shaved officer in a German uniform, even extremely loyal to the tsar, the Romanov dynasty and the Russian Empire, could not have a question: whom are we defending, to whom we obey and for whom, why are we going into battle ... And we ourselves, turns out who?! The defender and servant of the fatherland found himself, to put it mildly, in a rather difficult and very unclear position.

Many of the "acquisitions" of the time of Peter the Great turned out to be amazingly tenacious: for example, it became good manners for centuries to scold this "wild" Russia and find in it the most incredible shortcomings (even those that do not exist). Throughout the entire St. Petersburg period, the entire Soviet period of our history, an educated person was naturally, as it were, outside of Russia and only partly related to its people. That is, they rebelled against such a situation

177

many times, since the time of Prince Shcherbatov with his "On the Corruption of Morals in Russia", but everyone who did not like the formulas "the nobility and the people", "the intelligentsia and the people", from Prince Shcherbatov to village writers, remained a critical minority, and the norm was precisely this - to be aware of oneself as an "intelligentsia" existing outside the "people".

Other consequences of this "Peter's inversion" came back to haunt strange, bizarre combinations, it would seem, unconnectable: either with food chains under the lace of the secular heliporter of the time of Catherine, then the convulsive repentance of Grigory Potemkin immediately after the wildest spree, then the desire of Suvorov, who often blasphemed in his old age go to the monastery.

If we accept the Uspensky-Lotman hypothesis, then it turns out that Peter, strictly speaking, is not to blame for what happened. Russia could be reformed only by turning society's ideas around, changing pink to black, and vice versa. Only the Tsar-Antichrist could proclaim Holy Rus' black and ugly and change it almost beyond recognition, raise it on its hind legs. Peter had either courage, or arrogance, or god-fighting aspirations ... In a word, he had enough personal qualities to become this Antichrist in the eyes of modern

mennikov and bring the matter to an end.

... But just at this point, I will allow myself to remind you: do not consider what has been said, even with references to prominent scientists, as some kind of ultimate truth! There are no such truths in science.

And what's more, for all the logic of what Yu.M. Lotman and B.A. Uspensky, there is a lot of evidence of something else... For example, the fact that in Russian... in Muscovite, to be precise, culture in the 15th/27th century, the traditional boundaries of "sinful" and "righteous" were blurred, a stable layer of "neutral" ". Guaranteed for this are the incessant reforms of three generations of the Romanovs, from Mikhail Fedorovich to Fyodor Alekseevich and Sophia.

178

That is, there is no doubt about the fidelity of the Lotman-Uspensky theory, and the only question is that not a single theory covers ALL reality. The whole question is whether the theory of Lotman and Uspensky describes the most fundamental thing in the development of Muscovite culture. Could it be ONLY the way these two authors write, or were other options possible?

Could the area of the NEUTRAL, neither holy nor sinful, gradually expand in Muscovite culture?

If YES, then we have to admit: even though the arrogant boy Pyotr Alekseevich is who knows what an ornament on the throne, but if Princess Sofya won the internecine struggle, the wise elderly Vasily Golitsyn began the reforms, in the main he would act in exactly the same way (like any other who would have had the courage to start and the will to see it through to the end).

If NO, then it turns out that a DIFFERENT history of Muscovy and all of Russia was quite possible - without a monstrous breakthrough, rearing up a huge unfortunate country and without the Antichrist on the throne.

In any case, this option took place, with a coup and with the Antichrist king leading it.

ANTICHRIST - PEOPLE'S EVALUATION

But the great scholars are right or wrong, the history of Russia could have taken place without the deeds of Antichrist, or it could not have taken place, the people gave their assessment of what was happening: Peter turned out to be the only Russian autocrat in the entire history of Russia, whose name was never named by impostors. Even Nicholas I, Pavel I, Nicholas II -

not the most prominent personalities and not the most successful autocrats - and the comforts were "their" impostors - False Pauls and False Nicholas. Sometimes it is possible to establish the identity of those who hid under the name of the king, sometimes not, but, in any case, the cunning rebels were called by the names of these kings. But not in the name of Tsar Peter!

There are many stories about Peter, in which he appears both wise, and witty, and strong - but that's all.

179

literary anecdotes, saloon secular tales. This is the work of the top educated 2%. Those who were brought up on the cult of Peter, who thought of themselves and the people of their circle as "continuers of his work." The main part of the population of the country, those 98%, on whose labor the Russian Empire stood, treated Peter sharply negatively.

No matter how the reader treats the "medieval" and "backward" arguments about the Antichrist, the popular rumor is surprisingly accurate in one thing: as befits a satanic being, Peter did not completely die after his physical death.

Peter is the only one of the Russian tsars who, after his death, finally turned into a demon.

Peter!. Traditions, legends, fairy tales and anecdotes. M., 1993; Shte lin Ya. Genuine anecdotes about Peter the Great. Ch. J. M., 1830.

Chapter 2

## THE AFTERLIFE OF PETER

A woman walks past a cemetery, very afraid. A long, very thin man appears ahead.

- Can I go next to you?

"Of course, let's go together.

- I'm so afraid, so afraid! Are you not afraid at all?

While he was alive, he was afraid.

Joke

"HORRIES, ABOUT PETER

It is naive to think that all kinds of "horrors" about a person's communication with the devil, about temptation and falling into mortal sin are an invention of this or that writer. That is, we know these stories already in the author's processing, and each of them is closely associated with the name of the author ... the most famous, most talented of the authors who wrote on this subject.

It is difficult to separate the legend of Faust from the immortal work of Johann Goethe. There is nothing to argue about - Goethe created such a literary text that has been living in culture for two hundred years and will live at least as many more. Here is the struggle of feeling with duty, and the tragedy of a person who, in the pursuit of knowledge, is late to touch the joys of life, belatedly trying to "catch up". There is a philosophical dispute between good and evil, and the problem of self-determination, and ... in a word, there is a lot of things in Goethe's magnificent work.

181

But the fact of the matter is that the plot of Faust is not at all invented by Goethe. This story of urban folklore about a scientist who sold his soul to the devil has existed in Europe since at least the 10th, at least the 15th century. Another thing is that a plot is a plot, and each author fills it with his own understanding. Initially, in the folk legend, Dr. Faust nazi perished in the most significant way, having contacted the devil in order to obtain more and more new knowledge. Moral: in much knowledge there is a lot of sadness; know your place, man, and if you don't know, you will be punished.

In Goethe, Faust ends up in paradise, wrested from Satan by intervening forces of good, and another, not humble, but proud and powerful motive sounds:

I am committed to this idea! Years of life  
have passed not in vain; clear before me The  
final conclusion of the wisdom of the earth:

Only he is worthy of life and freedom, Who  
goes to fight for them every day!

But the plot is still folk, and not Goethe at all. What's behind it? I will not prove that such a person really lived - Faust (although there seems to be evidence for this). But after all, not one or two scientists of the XNUMXth or XNUMXth centuries experienced the strongest temptation: having felt how limited their knowledge was, how little was allotted to the forces of the human mind, to resort to a completely different force. How many of them could not resist, laid out the iron hexagon, read the incantations of the "Kabbalah" - I do not presume to judge. I also do not presume to judge what consequences their magical actions had - for whom and under what circumstances something appeared in the hexagon, for whom not ... But if the legends -

smoke, then there must have been fire, even if there was only a little fire, and the smokescreen was huge.

It is just as difficult to separate the old Spanish "horror" about don Juan and the immortal creations of Prosper Merimee "and A.S. Pushkinaz. But even behind these literary

' Goethe JW Faust. M., 1953. S. 342.

2 Merimee P. Souls of Purgatory// Merimee P. Sobr. essays in bt. T.2.M., 1963. S. 68-127.

182

behind my works and dozens of others, less talented and therefore less well-known, are medieval Spanish legends, a folk legend about a man who came too close to the line separating our world from the world of evil.

It is difficult to say what is in these legends and how much corresponds to reality. Was don Juan really descended from pious parents and studied at the University of Salamanca? Was there a case in his life when he asked for fire from a man walking along the other side of the Ebro River, and this creature stretched out across the entire river (about 150 meters) an outstretched hand like a rubber one with his cigar? Did don Juan really smoke from the devil's cigar, thank him politely, and move on?

It is difficult to vouch for the accuracy of such stories, but if there is a thick smoke screen, if it lasts for centuries, then, behind this curtain, there is probably at least a small tongue of living, red-yellow-blue fire.

The same is true with the legends about the posthumous life of Peter |.

Is it really true that in high water, with a wind from the bay and in bad weather, a tall man with a club in his hand, with insanely burning eyes, staggered along the banks of the Neva (there was no embankment then)? Was it really possible to meet him in a snowstorm, and in a snowstorm, and also on the banks or on the paths leading through the ice of the Neva? I would not vouch for the truthfulness of these stories, but, in any case, these stories were told in the 1730s and 1770s, even before the appearance of the Bronze Horseman. It was said that the giant beats the oncoming ones with a club, and if someone is not beaten to death, then this is the worst thing of all - a meeting with the ghost of Peter | portends misfortune, premature death of the closest people. If, God forbid, you ran into Peter, and he did not touch the baton, only glared at you with blood-red demonic eyes, then run home with all your might, run right away,

3ZPushkin A.S. Stone guest // Pushkin A.S. Sobr. essays vkht. T. W. S. 369-410.

183

hurry up if you want to have time to say goodbye to your dear creatures.

In 1782, the Bronze Horseman appeared in St. Petersburg, and immediately the corresponding stories began to be associated with him. Of course, The Bronze Horseman by Alexander Sergeevich Pushkin is an author's literary work, the immortality of which depends already on the talent of the author, and not on the properties of a folk legend. But Pushkin relied precisely on the legend!

At least from the very beginning of the 1790s, this layer of urban folklore has been known: the ability to break off the pedestal and gallop around the city in search of a bloody sacrifice was attributed to the monument to Peter. It happened, as you might guess, on dark autumn nights, when the wind drove water from the bay to the Neva, threatening floods, and low clouds sowed rain and did not let the light of stars into Petersburg. The fearsome horseman, according to the legends, went hunting in snowstorms and blizzards, when the December day lasted only a few hours, and the inhabitants of St. Petersburg almost all the time lived by the light of those very imperfect lanterns and candles.

Is it true? Is not it? It is also very difficult to say, it is not easy to distinguish the sparkle of a light behind the smoke layers. Although, in fact, there are testimonies of those who ran away from the monstrous rider, hearing "a heavy copper gallop along the cobblestone pavement" behind them, and police documents devoted to the investigation of more than strange deaths: they were found, say, a stone's throw from the Admiralty corpses, literally driven into the ground by a terrible weight, on which there was not a single whole BONE.

I won't vouch for anything, I'm not at all sure of the veracity of all these stories - maybe a gang of robbers was operating in St. Petersburg, specially "working" under a folk legend? But this is how they began to talk about Peter in the very first years, decades after his death, that's what is important. Pushkin wrote his "horror stick of the 20th century" based on urban folklore...

184

and maybe he knew about the existence of some documents  
cops.

In this story, of course, bright tongues are also interesting.



fire, which are very well visible through the smoke of folk legends. It would be very interesting to find out what is documented in them and what is not particularly documented, what information can be trusted and what not so distant ancestors encountered.

But the point is not even the authenticity of this or that evidence. The people gave the Antichrist-king a very definite place in the legends. An exceptional place, not at all similar to the place of other kings in people's memory.

Indeed, in St. Petersburg they stubbornly talked and talk about meetings with at least two emperors: with Nikolai II, who is sometimes seen in a strong snowstorm on Palace Square, with Paul I, who walks around the Engineering Castle on full moons. But both of these ghosts are completely harmless! There was even a testimony of a certain tradesman who did not find anything smarter than to ask Nikolai I:

"Is that you, your royal majesty?!"

To which he received a magnificent, truly royal answer:

"Don't you see yourself, you fool?!"

But the ghost did not at all punish the tradesman for his distrust, much less began to beat him with a club or stomp on him; angry for stupidity and for lack of imagination, and ONLY.

The terrible features of the messenger of death, the otherworldly killer, preying on lonely travelers, rumor ascribes to Peter, and only to Peter. Meeting with Nikolai I, by the way, at the end of the twentieth century was considered a happy omen: I saw Emperor Nikolai - wait for a promotion. How lucky many are, I don't know, but there are dozens of testimonies of meetings with Nikolai. And no ill effects!

Is it really the ghost of Peter I met Peter Shi Pavel I? Again, I can't vouch for anything, but even in these

185

In meetings, Peter appears as a messenger of misfortunes that should fall on the reigning dynasty, the bearer of all kinds of horrors. Is it any wonder that both emperors fell ill after meeting with their grandfather and great-grandfather, and both were killed by conspirators? When it comes to Peter, nothing else is to be expected.

By the way, about the monuments... In Scandinavia, they talk about the otherworldly life of several monuments, but not all of them, these reviving monuments, are dangerous. The properties of monuments are closely related to the nature of the one to whom

they are set. If the Swede talks to the monument to Karl [X, it's not even bad at all. The last time such a conversation took place, according to rumors, was only fifteen years ago, in 1986, but it was reported by a student who, by his own admission, had not dried out for the third week, and the report must be recognized as unreliable. But it's a fact that the student got out of his binge after this story and began to study much better - this is a fact! So if they really sat with the monument on the rocks near one of the Stockholm archipelago and smoked one pipe, it didn't hurt the guy at all.

But about the monument to Gustavus Adolphus they tell such things that not always the tongue will turn to tell by the night. For example, a tendency to cannibalism is attributed to him ... And as if there were evidence that

thee and old, the XVII century.

So here, too, the Bronze Horseman fits into a rather gloomy pattern and finds himself in a company as dangerous as it is unpleasant.

That is, to put it simply, in the minds of the people, Peter was not only the Antichrist during his lifetime. And after his death, he became a demon, just as dangerous for the rightly glorious people who are still alive. Only now, fortunately, he does not have such large-scale opportunities to do evil, as in

life.

Features of something unnatural, abnormal

there is even in the city of St. Petersburg itself.

186

## LEGENDS CREATED SPECIALLY

The most important of the legends, created already during the life of Peter, is the legend that Peterburg was built in an uninhabited, remote place, "on the shore of desert waves." The children's writer S.P. presents this fairy tale most beautifully. Alekseev. Informing readers to begin with that "From a long time ago, Russians were considered good sailors. They made long voyages and traded with other nations. But the enemies sought to take away access to the sea from Russia..."", the writer continues downright epic: they say, once Peter and Menshikov were sailing in a boat, where Petersburg would later appear, they walked around the islands, and Menshikov fell into a swamp, barely pulled out the jackboot. "Peter went to the tussock, carefully parted the bushes, and Menshikov saw the nest. There was a bird in the nest. She looked at people with surprise, did not fly away.

- Look you! Menshikov said. — Bold!

The bird suddenly flapped its wings, took off, and began to fly around the bush.

Here poor Menshikov loses his second jackboot, sat down to put it on, and Pyotr steps aside, and...

"Danilych! Peter spoke again.

Menshikov was worried.

"Here by the sea," Peter waved his hand, "here by the sea," he repeated, "we will build a city."

Menshikov's over the knee boots fell out of his hands by itself.

- City? he asked. - Here, in these swamps, a city ?!

"Yes," Peter answered, and walked along the shore.

And Menshikov continued to sit on the stone and looked with surprised, enthusiastic eyes at the receding figure of Peter.

A frightened bird was flying along the shore. She then soared up, then fell down and announced with her cry the untouched shores.

—

Alekseev S.P. The unimaginable happens. M., 1980. S. 134.

\*

Alekseev S.P. The unimaginable happens. M., 1980. S. 188.

187

The colorful spectacle of the construction of Petersburg in a completely empty and wild place, in the land of fearless birds, would look even better if there were no absolutely accurate information - the Petersburg region is one of the most populated regions of the Izhora land.

According to the Swedish plan of 1676, 41 settlements of various sizes are shown on the site of St. Petersburg and its environs. One of them, with the Finnish name C5\$a4\$\$\$-zaag! - at the place where the Winter Bridge is now located and the Palace Bridge begins.

In Nienschanz, the largest city that stood on the site of the future Petersburg, "there were many excellent sawmills, and good and beautiful ships were built there; in addition to the Swedish, Finnish and German parish, there was also an Orthodox one with a church. From Nyenschantz a ferry went to the left bank of the Neva, to the lying

mu here the Russian village of Spassky. Pylyayev cites the words of a certain Miller: "Not only Lübeck, but also Amsterdam began to bargain with Nienschanz; the waterway from there to Novgorod greatly contributed to this. Little by little, the Russian merchants in Nyenschanz also entered and brought this place to such fame that in recent years one local merchant, nicknamed Frisius, could lend considerable sums of money to the Swedish king Karl II at the beginning of his war with Peter the Great, for which he was later granted nobility, and instead of the former, he was given the nickname Friesenheim and was appointed a judge in Vilmanstrand.

Under the Swedes, the population of villages and towns at the mouth of the Neva was at least 6-7 thousand people. Any construction on the territory of St. Petersburg was carried out either directly on the site of Russian and Finnish villages (the villages were demolished at the same time), or in the immediate vicinity of them.

As you can see, there is no need to seriously talk about birds that have hysterical from one kind of person, just another fairy tale, and nothing more. And it is too well understood why this fairy tale is needed: to attribute to Peter the turn

\ Pylyayev M.I. Old Petersburg. SPb., 1889. 188

noah feat of Hercules, to emphasize once again that there was literally nothing before him. So, "an empty Finnish swamp" with birds that have never seen a person.

It is interesting that Peter's contemporaries also took this tale seriously - for example, Feofan Prokopovich, and they knew very well what was on the site of St. Petersburg before Peter, even if they themselves did not take the Swedish fortresses and did not talk with the Russian population of Izhora earth. But not only contemporaries! The authors of two classic St. Petersburg stereotypes: about the "shores of desert waves" and about the "empty Finnish swamp" are A.S. Pushkin and F.M. Dostoevsky. The tale about the construction of St. Petersburg from scratch is repeated even now, and for the population of St. Petersburg itself, this story serves as convincing proof that their city is special, amazing, and that something completely unusual must definitely happen in it.

new.

But why is this bike so dear to the heart of a Russian? And as in the 17th century there was a road, so is the road to this day? Let's try to answer this question, but a little later.

## UNNATURAL CITY

Most often, cities grow in the center of their land.

whether as their heart, as their embodiment. So Rome grew up - the heart of a huge empire, Paris and London, Stockholm and Krakow. This is how Moscow grew. In such cities, naturally, "genetic" myths arise - myths about the gathering of land around the city, about the events of its growth, origin and development.

But it happens that a city is deliberately built not in the heart, but on the edge of its land. For what? And in order to emphasize - the monarch claims more than he has! If the city is located on the edge, then it turns out that the emperor does not recognize the current borders of the country as final. The capital should be in the center,

189

and he builds his capital in the center of the FUTURE state. This already declares that a really existing country, as it were, "in fact" does not exist, that it is only a part of the country that is to be born.

So, Emperor Constantine moved his capital from Rome to the city of Byzantium, which now became known as Constantinople. A completely new city arose, not in the center of the empire, but on its edge. Constantinople was built to break the old, semi-pagan traditions of Rome and the new traditions of the Christian empire. Already in his position there was a claim to make Persia and other "not yet Christian" lands part of the empire, and the neighbors perfectly felt this challenge.

And besides, Constantinople declared the history of Rome only the beginning of some more important history, the Roman Empire - only a part of some larger empire. He and his companions imagined nothing less than the globe, united by the most Christian emperor. It is no coincidence that Constantine was the first to pick up a new symbol of power - orb, that is, a ball overshadowed by a cross.

The same act was made by the Prince of Kiev, Svyatoslav, when he transferred the capital of Rus' from Kyiv to a new town, Pereyaslavl-on-the-Danube. By doing so, he announced his intention to create an empire, of which Kievan Rus would be a part, and most of which had yet to be conquered from Byzantium. Svyatoslav's plan was not crowned with success, but it could well have been crowned - barbarian kingdoms were created on the territory of the former Western Roman Empire. And most importantly, an act is a principle. pially the same as the act of the Roman Emperor Constantine, and the Muscovite Tsar Peter [.

In such cities, located eccentrically, on the edge of their land, other myths are naturally created along with everything: cosmological myths - about the creation of a city, country and state. Not about slow, law-

measured growth, but specifically about creation. Stack up mi

190

eschatological myths are about the end of the world, demiurgical myths are about the creation accomplished by the sages and giant mi-demiurges.

So, regardless of anything else, St. Petersburg would inevitably have to give rise to these restless, intense myths, to create an alarming psychological environment for its inhabitants. So in Constantinople, the opposition of not comprehended nature and created by people, elements and man, the collective power of the inhabitants of the empire, which created the city where only ten or twenty years ago stood only impoverished fishing villages, was always especially emphasized.

But the fact of the matter is that the mythology of St. Petersburg from the very beginning did not stop at the opposition of the natural and the man-made, the elemental and the created. The myths of creation in a strange way focus on the personality of Peter and in a strange way speak not so much about the power of man, but about the power of those who help Peter... And it is not the Lord God who helps him, as you understand.

Here is one very typical legend: they say that it would be impossible to build Petersburg in such a swampy place, the abyss would swallow it up house after house. It was possible to build Petersburg only all at once, entirely, and it was possible to build it only in the sky, and then immediately take it and lower it all to the ground. And who is up to such a task? Only Antichrist.

This legend is attributed to the Finns, but obviously only attributed - after all, it was not the Finns who talked about the Antichrist, and, of course, someone who, but the Finns knew very well whether the quagmire could withstand individual houses - after all, Nyenschanz built before their eyes with its 2000 residential buildings, sawmills and churches, other cities and villages did not think of falling anywhere. Such legends were attributed to the Finns in order to give them antiquity and origin from a slightly mysterious, "witchy" people who lived in these places long before the Russians.

191

V.F. Odoevsky conveys this legend as follows: "Around him (Peter. - A. B.) there is only sea sand, and bare stones, and swamps, and swamps. The king has gathered his veineleys! and says to them, "Build me a city where I can live while I build a ship." And they began to build a city, but if they lay a stone, the swamp will suck it up; too many stones

they piled it on, rock upon rock, log upon log, but the swamp takes everything into itself, and at the top of the earth one swamp remains. Meanwhile, the king built a ship, looked around: he looked, there was no city yet. "You don't know how to do anything," he said to his people, and with this word he began to lift rock after rock and forge it in the air. So he built a whole city and lowered it to the ground.

Odoevsky still pretends that this is a Finnish legend, but the same legend was published in 1924 as a folklore, as part of urban folklore - and, of course, not Finnish at all:

"Petersburg built a hero on the abyss. He built the first house of his city on the abyss - the abyss swallowed him up. The hero builds a second house - the same fate. God tyr does not lose heart - and the third house is eaten by an evil abyss. Then the hero fell into thought, frowned his black eyebrows, wrinkled his broad forehead, and evil lights lit up in his big black eyes. The hero thought for a long time and he will come. He spread out his heroic palm, built his city on it at once and lowered it into the abyss. The abyss could not eat up the whole city, it had to submit, and the city of Petra remained the goal.

Naturally, in the very creation of the city "in the air", and in its construction "on the abyss", and in the swamp that splashes under the stone, there is something deeply unnatural, something contrary to the whole natural and normal course of events and the usual state of affairs.

Russians in Finnish are called "venelainen". Apparently, Prince Vladimir Odoevsky had this word in mind. — A. B.

2 Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 2. Rostov-on-Don, 2000.

192

It turns out that St. Petersburg is not just a city posed eccentrically, but a city created in a magical, incredible way, and the very existence of this city is mysterious and incredible.

#### SELECTING A CONSTRUCTION LOCATION

Many historians, at least since the time of V.O. Klyuchevsky is paid attention to - they say, the very emergence of St. Petersburg is accidental. This city arose at that brief moment, between 1701 and 1710, when the first seizures of land on the Baltic coast had already taken place. And whether there will be new ones is still completely unknown. In 1703, Peter could still have

the desire to build a new city on the lands already recaptured from the Swedes. After 17710, when both Revel and Riga were in his hands, there was no longer any need to build such a city.

Logically! But after all, even before 1710 there was no need to build St. Petersburg precisely on Zayachiy or on Vasilyevsky Island. If Peter needed a port in the Baltic, why shouldn't he use the already captured Nyenschantz? Or not to set up a new city in a strong place where the Neva flows out of Lake Ladoga? Any of these options would be better, more convenient than the chosen one, and the conclusion suggests itself that Peter wanted to build a new port exactly where he started to build it.

Vladimir Osipovich Klyuchevsky is absolutely right - if we are talking about the need for a port in the Baltic, then with the capture of Revel and Riga, it was no longer necessary to build anything.

Even if it was necessary to transfer the capital to the Baltic, and then Revel, and Riga, and Nyenschanz, and Noteburg would be quite suitable ...

But no! Peter frankly wanted to build a new city. Not just a port or even a new capital, but YOUR city. Only your own, the city is only Petra, and build it on your own. So that no one but him has

193

would have nothing to do with the construction of this city. This plan also included building it in the most inconvenient, most difficult place for construction. In such a way that there are more difficulties, and the opposition of the natural and the created by man is maximum. The city is a symbol of its power. The city is the symbol of its empire. The city is a monument to its creator. A city where he can live even after he dies.

It is known that Peter adored Petersburg, called it "paradise", that is, paradise, and was completely uncritical towards it. Mechanic Andrei Nartov, who knew Peter personally and often communicated with him, reports that when "on the occasion of the newly established assemblies or congresses between gentlemen in St. Petersburg, Parisian manners, customs and rituals were praised in the presence of the sovereign, he answered as follows:" It is good to adopt the arts and sciences from the French. I would like to see this in my place, but by the way, Paris stinks. Petersburg, apparently, emitted a fragrance ...

Captured Swede Lars Johan Ehrenmalm reports that "the tsar became so attached with all his heart and feelings to St. Petersburg that he would hardly be able to part with it voluntarily and without strong coercion." Next Ehrenmalm pe-



he says that the tsar said more than once or twice, kissing the cross, that it would be easier for him to part with half of his kingdom than with Petersburg alone.

However, there is a lot of other evidence, both Russian and foreign, in favor of the fact that Peter opposed Petersburg not only to the hated Moscow, but also to the whole world in general - to Paris, and London, and Stockholm, and ... in a word, everything in the world.

This convulsive, uncritical, extreme love is not quite common for a port, and even for one's own capital, but is understandable for its offspring, for a city created as a place for life and a place of final resting place.

194

## LEGEND NAME

A modern person (including a resident of St. Petersburg) rarely doubts that this city is named after Peter [. In fact, the city was named after Saint Peter. The city of St. Peter had the same heavenly patron as Rome - that is, it claimed the same significant position in the world.

At the same time, the coat of arms of St. Petersburg contained the same motifs as the coat of arms of Rome (although, of course, properly modified): the crossed keys in the coat of arms of the Vatican correspond to the crossed anchors in the coat of arms of St. Petersburg?. The city was associated with Constantinople, and with Rome, and with Jerusalem. Than only he was not in the imagination of the creators!

But already during the life of Peter, in the minds of his contemporaries (and Peter himself too) became the city of Peter [. Andrey Nartov, already mentioned, conveys the following words of Peter, who was just getting into the boat to sail to his house - a log hut, built for him by soldiers in three days: "A city will grow from a small hut. Where fishermen used to live, the capital of Petra is being built here. All the time with the help of God.

This was said in 1703, when the Peter and Paul Fortress was just being erected, and the glorious future of "St.

Moreover, by the end of the 15th century, by the 20th century, Petersburg became in the mass consciousness the "city of Peter", and although the educated inhabitants of the city and the empire remember very well who the original name was given in honor of, Petersburg is

Uspensky B.A., Lotman M.Yu. Echoes of the concept "Moscow - the Third Rome" in the ideology of Peter the Great (on the problem of medieval tradition in baroque culture) // Uspensky B.A. Selected works. T. J. M., 1996. S. 124-141, 128-129.

\* Villinbakhov Yu.I. The Foundation of St. Petersburg and the Imperial Emblem of Teak // Proceedings on sign systems. XU. Scientific notes of the Tartu states. university. Issue. 664. Tartu, 1984, pp. 46-55.

195

much more the city of Petra | than St. Peter's. "The city of Peter ascended ... proudly," wrote A.S. Pushkin. Which Peter? The Bright Apostle, the key-keeper of Peter, who lets the worthy into paradise, or that Peter, to whom the creation of St. Petersburg is attributed ("I love you, Peter's creation" ...)? Analyzing the texts, it is very easy to understand which of Petrov Alexander Ser is referring to.

Geevich.

And at the ordinary level, for a mass and not very educated person, this is not discussed.

## CITY OR TOMB?

It turns out absolutely amazing thing! Whatever functions St. Petersburg performs, whatever roles it plays: the role of a capital, a port, an industrial center, a center for the Europeanization of the rest of Russia, it plays another role, performs another absolutely amazing function. It is a kind of colossal tomb for its creator, Peter |.

A city built in an incredible way where it was absolutely impossible to build it, and most importantly, absolutely unnecessary. A city whose very existence is astonishing, a city that challenges the elements, the natural course of events and the normal order of things. This city turns out to be about the same as the Valley of the Kings, or the City of the Dead, was for the ancient Egyptians. The difference is that the City of the Dead existed separately from the city of the living, and not only the pharaohs found their final resting place in it, but also many of their close associates and servants, right down to the most common people who happened to be workers in the house or in the estate of the pharaoh or his entourage.

And St. Petersburg is the most lively city; a city that lives and develops and, to say nothing of anything else, is less and less like the military-feudal "paradise" that Peter wanted to see it. But at the same time, Petersburg is a tomb, a colossal tomb of one person. According to the Egyptians,

and other peoples of the Ancient East, the pharaoh must live in his tomb - live not in the figurative sense of the word, not as a literary or cultural metaphor, but in the most literal, direct sense of the word. Approximately the way Peter lives in St. Petersburg. After all, there are references in the Egyptian sources to the battles waged by the priests who guarded the City of the Dead - natural battles with the use of weapons, with the wounded and killed. Among modern scholars, it is believed that the enemies of the priests were robbers who penetrated the City of the Dead in order to rob the tombs of the pharaohs and their nobles.

But just Peter I, who either guards those he meets with a club, or falls on those gaping with a multi-ton mass of a bronze horse, allows us to give another interpretation of these very ancient events.

Peter continues to live in his tomb-Petersburg to this day. If some materialist finds my assertion unacceptable that he lives there as some kind of material being, then let it be so: he lives in St. Petersburg in the mass consciousness, or rather, then, in the mass subconsciousness of Russian people.

#### Chapter 3

### ABOUT THE REGULAR STATE

"Are you saying that when your ancestor, Major Hodson, shot three brothers, the last Great Mughals, he acted in their interests?!"

"To a certain extent, yes," said the major.

P. Daninos

But still - what did Peter the Great want to create in Russia? What exactly does this "regular state" mean? The idea of such a state was born in Germany in the middle of the 18th century. It was never an idea that captured the minds of millions or even hundreds of thousands of people. Most of the Germans, if they have heard of it, are very vague, and hardly have any idea what it is all about. This also applies to sovereign princes, that is, those who stood at the helm of the state and might be interested - what new ways have philosophers come up with to control people? Many of these sovereign princes and their entourage must have read the writings of Wulf and Puffendorf, but none of the nearly 300 German statesmen

states did not even try to become a "regular state".

The idea of a "regular state" remained a pure theoretical idea, an intellectual armchair construction, which, if it was discussed seriously, was precisely as a philosophical idea, and at most by several hundred people throughout Germany, university professors and their students.

198

And the idea itself, on closer examination, turns into an attempt to apply the basic principles of mechanics to the life of society, to present social life in a simplified to primitive form. Even later, the humanities were tempted to transfer to "their" sciences what is considered "advanced" in science. The 17th and 15th centuries in Europe are the time of the unconditional domination of mechanics. To many, mechanics seemed to be a kind of "truth of life", showing "real" relationships in all areas of life in general. The Universe itself seemed to be like a gigantic clock; both Galileo Galilei and Nicolaus Copernicus wrote about "celestial mechanics" and "mechanics of the spheres".

Scientists and philosophers of Germany - first of all, Gottfried Leibniz and his students - Wolf, Puffendorf, Grotius - represented both society and man in the form of simple, completely unambiguous mechanical schemes, and they reduced the wear in society and the state to the movements of the most elementary figures.

For Leibniz, the state seemed like a huge clock: "just as in a clock one wheel sets in motion another, so in the great state machine one collegium must set in motion another, and if everything is arranged with exact proportion and harmony, then the arrow of life will show the country happy

watch".

Wolf went perhaps even further: "The government should have the right and duty to force everyone to work, set wages and prices for goods, take care of the construction of good streets, strong and beautiful buildings, delight the eyes of the townsfolk with pictures pleasing to the eye, and ears - music, the singing of birds and the murmur of water, to promote public entertainment with theatrical performances and other spectacles, to encourage poetry, to strive for the schooling of children, to see that adults are diligent in virtue and piety.

The duty of the subjects, according to Wolff, INCLUDES "READY AND WILLINGLY Do what the government finds necessary for the general well-being."

199

`In the scientific school of the "regular state system" two lines were mixed: the understanding of society and the state as a mechanism and the idea of a state that suppresses society and directs absolutely everything. As can be seen from the words of Wolf, even the singing of birds and the murmur of water.

But let me emphasize once again that in Germany itself, no one was particularly eager to use these wonderful ideas and achieve unheard-of bliss in their state.

The fact remains that Peter idolized the mechanical scientists; the ideas of a "regular state" aroused in him the most complete delight. Peter corresponded with Leibniz for many years, and even invited Wolf to head the St. Petersburg Decision Academy of Sciences. Characteristically, the clever Wolf categorically refused.

It is no less characteristic that Peter never read any of the writings of Leibniz or Puffendorf. These works were read by many of the Dolgoruky and Golitsyn, Yakov Bruce read. Peter instructed Bruce to compile a synopsis for him - that is, a summary, an excerpt from the works of Leibniz. But we have no information that all these persons sought to organize a "regular state" in Rus' or would show a particular passion for this theory.

But Peter, who knew about the "regular state" from the letters of Wolf and Leibniz, and from the notes of Yakov Bruce, began on his own, by his own will, to rebuild the life of Muscovy on a "regular basis." There are two states in history built according to theoretical ideas: one of them is the USA, organized according to the ideas of Jefferson!. The second is the Russian Empire, built by Peter according to the ideas of the "regular state" of Leibniz. That is, of course, neither the United States nor (especially) the Russian empire was built from beginning to end according to theories - and this is impossible to do. Both of these states tried to build according to theo

1 Shlesinger A.M. cycles of American history. M., 1992.

200

theoretical ideas, but it turned out not at all what was expected.

Here is perhaps the shortest and most accurate diagnosis of what happened under Peter - Peter made an attempt to build an artificial society and state. For

In doing so, he destroyed the natural society, the relations in which took shape over the centuries. And he turned the state from a "committee on social affairs" into a tool for introducing his favorite idea into life.

MAYBE THIS IS ALL THE MASONS?!

It is extremely difficult to talk about this mysterious phenomenon for exactly one reason: because the Freemasons absolutely do not say anything about themselves. Those who take the trouble to write about them describe in detail what the ideology of the Freemasons is and what exactly they want. They say that Masons strive to build a society and a state on the basis of rationalism, purely rational ideas and ideas, reject the traditions and historical experience of states and peoples. They unite in order to enlighten and make mankind happy - to the extent of their understanding of what enlightenment and happiness are. Freemasons consider very important what in the USSR was called "bourgeois values", and now, with the light hand of Gorbachev, they are most often called "universal" values: that is, personal rights and freedoms of a person, publicity of courts, freedom of the press, restriction of powers power, rejection of torture and humiliation of human dignity, political democracy. To achieve this, they are ready to use lies, cruelty and violence, driving all of us into happiness with iron and blood.

In their multi-secret organization, the strictest hierarchy reigns, and each Mason knows exactly what a Mason of his level should know about his organization. As the Masonic career progresses, so does the Mason's competence. Accordingly, the heads of Masonic organizations may have very different knowledge and even different goals than ordinary members of the organization.

201

The most important and most secret intentions of Masons is to achieve world domination. This goal is so secret that it is hidden even from most members of Masonic organizations, but for some reason it is perfectly known to everyone who "studies" and criticizes Freemasonry.

In fact, Freemasons proclaim the equality of people of different nations and accept into their lodges everyone (and those whom they themselves consider worthy), but one can argue who exactly is at the head of world Freemasonry.

"There are two assumptions: either Freemasonry is the work of England, who wants to bring all other peoples to anarchy in order to seize world power, or it was created by the Jews to achieve the same goal."

Frankly, I myself am incredibly interested in whether such a super-powerful society exists and whether an amazing conspiracy to achieve world domination has actually been going on for five (or fifteen?) centuries. The difficulty is that we have all this fascinating information only from one side - from those who denounce Freemasonry and raise the masses to fight against the terrible order. Now, if at least one Freemason for five centuries would let it slip ...

In the opinion of many, Masons appear in Russia just in the era of Peter I, and very much in his decisions, in the features of the "regular state" that he was going to build, is explained precisely by Masonic influence. After all, Leibniz, and Wolfe, and Lefort, and Jacob Bruce are Freemasons (the fact that he is a Scot works especially against Jacob Bruce - it is believed that Scottish lodges are the most terrible). Here, they say, these people "slip" Peter I the idea of a "regular state", and thereby destroyed the "good morals" in Russian society and laid a mine under the very historical existence of Russia.

To be frank, I am not particularly enthusiastic about discussing this idea. Firstly, because I do not have serious data that would allow both to reject once and for all

1 Tol S.D. Night brothers. M., 2000. S. 247. 202

always the idea of Masonic influence on Peter (and the role of Masons in the subsequent history of Russia), and to confirm it. That is, one can endlessly argue on this topic, citing endless confirmations of both opinions ... And so there is nothing else to come, because the researcher does not have any firmly established facts, there are only "opinions", "judgments" and "assessments".

In science, such topics are called "speculative"; these are topics that can be both confirmed and refuted with equal success. For example, not so long ago the press talked a lot about the problem of "space aliens"; to the scientist, this problem does not seem very interesting, precisely because it is absolutely impossible to solve it with the existing database. At one time, the French Academy of Sciences refused to consider the issue of creating a "perpetual motion machine". Likewise I refuse to discuss the question of Freemasonry.

But it is necessary to speak on this topic precisely because the problem has been raised, and even refusing to further talk on this topic, you must at least explain why you are refusing.

My own contribution to the problem will be, first of all, this position of "wise ignorance" – I don't know what role Freemasons played in the history of Russia.

I will not discuss this until I am presented with evidence of serious documents.

Let me also note that the Masonic theme is too often and very straightforwardly used for the most primitive self-justification. If it is true that the Masonic organizations slipped Lefort to Peter first so that he would make him drunk and corrupt the tsar, and then, through the hands of Jacob Bruce, they gave him the idea of other Masons, Puffendorf and Leibniz, the idea of a "regular state", then it turns out that they are responsible for everything that happened. These are all their intrigues: the collapse of the economy, the crisis of statehood, the exodus of robbers, the split of the people into two nations.

To this I will answer briefly and clearly: NO! Let us imagine that everything was as the accusers of Freemasonry write. That is, Peter was really drunk, corrupted, deceived

203

the ghost of a "regular state" beckoned like a donkey with a carrot. But even in this case, I see no reason to remove responsibility from him, and from the entire top of Russian society in 1689, and from the entire population of Muscovy.

Was he soldered, corrupted? And why did he drink himself into drinking and in what place did he think, corrupting himself?

Was it imposed on Russia? And what place did Russia think, allowing itself to impose an incompetent tsar?

Did Masons destroy Russian society with the hands of Peter and his associates? Why did Russian society allow itself to be destroyed?

In such pairs of statements, very different visions of people and situations are revealed. If some people want to shift the responsibility from themselves to someone else at any cost (if it's to anonymous but fabulously powerful Masons, then it's quite good), then others do not at all experience positive emotions from this. And in any situation, they try to find not the "culprit" of some bad events, but the reason. Indeed, why did the ancestors act in this way and not otherwise?

And I would like to draw the reader's attention to one more very curious circumstance. The fact is that the whole of Soviet society and some of its subsystems are organized according to the very principles that are attributed to Masons.

Indeed, in the USSR there was a clear connection between a person's knowledge, his education and social status. The young generation of the nomenklatura wanted to be at least candidates of science, and all



possible "academies of Marxism-Leninism" gave them an easy, convenient way to achieve this. At least theoretically, the increase in knowledge also gave access to new levels of social career. And vice versa - those who penetrated each new step were allowed to learn what was completely forbidden to know on the lower steps. For reading Solzhenitsyn, a "simple engineer" could well have received a prison term. And an employee of any regional committee could freely read Solzhenitsyn, but he no longer had the right to know from whom Lenin was born.

204

elk. An employee of the Ideological Department of the Central Committee was supposed to know this, no less.

This is about Soviet society as a whole. And there was a subsystem in it, created completely according to Masonic recipes - at least according to those recipes that are called Masonic by the enemies of Masons and fighters against them. And what is characteristic is that this subsystem was actually created by Peter!

I mean, of course, the Academy of Sciences.

Peter's decree of January 28, 1724 created a new DEPARTMENT with its own staff of officials. It was possible to become an official of the academy after receiving the appropriate education and having a scientific degree. That is, all scientists, just like Freemasons in their lodges, are divided into several formal degrees: junior laboratory assistants, laboratory assistants, senior laboratory assistants, junior research assistants, research assistants, senior research assistants, chief research assistants, leading research assistants. To this is added the division into "non-graded" scientists, into candidates of sciences and doctors of sciences, who are also associate professors and professors, and in the "heaven" of the system there are also corresponding members and full members of the Academy of Sciences.

The system is cumbersome, complex, and at least theoretically, but derived all on the same principle - the more knowledge, the higher the rank in the system. And after all, no one bothers to get as much knowledge as possible (again, at least theoretically), and with their acquisition, to raise one's status. And the system, just like Masonic societies, monitors the behavior of its members and promotes worthy, from the point of view of Masons, scientists to higher levels of initiation.

The role of the Academy of Sciences in the system of Soviet society is also quite in the spirit of the Freemasons: the role of those who collect information about the most diverse aspects of reality, and then develop some grandiose projects (Stalin's plan for changing nature, the plan for diverting the flow of northern rivers to Central Asia, a plan to create

writing among non-literate peoples, and so on), or

205

advises government agencies. However, it is not the Academy of Sciences that executes superprojects; if necessary, one can always absolve oneself of responsibility by saying that the project was carried out incorrectly.

The similarity of Soviet society, and especially its intellectual institutions, with what is attributed to the Freemasons is absolutely striking, and there can be exactly two explanations for this.

1. Masons created many institutions in the Russian Empire, including the Academy of Sciences. And then, when they seized power throughout the Russian Empire, they organized society according to the traditions of their lodges.

2. Soviet intellectuals, a huge number of employees of the Academy of Sciences, simply transferred their ideas about the optimal social system to the mysterious adversary: strictly hierarchical, closed to the uninitiated, operating by strictly undercover methods.

It is very difficult for a person brought up in Soviet society to imagine that Western civil society is very efficient; he hardly understands the psychology of the people of this society, the motives of their actions. But he very easily understands the actions of a closed bureaucratic system, the basis of the ranks of which is the possession of this or that information. It is no coincidence that at the decline of the USSR, The Godfather by M. Puzo was sold in such huge circulations: the laws of mafia life and the behavior of mafiosi are very well understood by Soviet people.

Perhaps the ideas about Masonic societies, this intellectual super-mafia, are also constructed on the basis of their own psychology?

#### PREDISPOSITION TO JUMP IN UGOPIU

Very often the conviction is expressed (often in an accusatory tone) that Peter was deliberately "taught" some bad, harmful and dangerous ideas. Here, they say, almost triumphantly convinced "patriots" - here, Peter borrowed alien to Russia for

206

bad ideas, and that's why everything became so bad and sad.

Here, they say, is the reason for the monstrous growth of bureaucracy, the decline in the population, the wild quirks in culture - here it is, the root cause - "fashionable ideas mechanically borrowed from the West" '.

Frankly, I find it strange to find out who is to blame - who created the utopian idea, or who voluntarily jumped into utopia.

As far as I know, neither Puffendorf nor Leibniz forced their ideas on Muscovy, either by force of arms or by force of bank loans.

And here I am compelled to remind you for the third time that in Germany itself, Leibniz's ideas were by no means a guide to action. That is, Leibniz himself commanded great respect in society; in general, this is one of the most sympathetic and attractive features of German culture - consistent respect for learned people, veneration of smart people, high social status of professors. But what was the position here? So you wrote another scientific book and you prove something interesting in it? Well done! What a pleasure to deal with a scientist and an active person! We will gladly publish this book, discuss it and highly appreciate your intellect and talent. We will put you in a place of honor at dinner with a duke or king, we will respect you together, we will let the students read another course and pay good money. But to begin to remake life the way it is written in your book? Hm... You'd better sit still in your office, read lectures and think - maybe you'll write something no less interesting.

Germany did not at all seek to jump into utopia ... at least in the 15th century. The point here is not some natural perfection of the Germans; the day will come when Germany will seize upon the utopia of racial theory, a utopia even wilder and more repulsive than the utopia of the "regular state." But then the time has not come, because societies rush into utopias not because of the quality of the utopias themselves, but because of completely different reasons.

Bushkov A.A. Russia, which was not. M., 1997. S. 399. 207

After all, the "City of the Sun" by Tommaso Campanella was published as early as 1623, but neither in his native Italy, nor in other European countries, did anyone even think of abolishing private property and the family, building a "society of the future." Everyone shrugged, that's all.

In the same way, Fourier in the twentieth century wrote to all the kings, prime ministers and wealthy people in Europe, telling everyone how they needed to give up the state, private property and the family and begin to live in a community of mi-phalansters. But, as far as I know, he did not receive a response from any of his addressees - no one

not interested in the ravings of a half-mad talker.

Society claims utopias and tries to rebuild life according to them only in one case: if rapid development threatens the same rapid, irreversible

changes.

Utopias are needed by those who want to take the technical level of European civilization, advanced countries, but do not want the same type of society to be established in their country. He who wants to have the same things as the Europeans, to live as richly, but does not want to live as freely.

We can say even more harshly: attempts to introduce utopias into life are generated by the fear of freedom. It is no coincidence that utopias are created, as a rule, in the most developed countries, but are carried out not in the center, but on the periphery of Europe: in those very countries whose inhabitants are threatened by the loss of their habitual way of life due to rapid industrial and cultural development.

But there is a strange regularity here, not very clear to me: the experience of history shows that the Slavic peoples are especially predisposed to jump into utopia. Judge for yourself! Neither on the island of Corsica nor in Sicily have any such utopias ever been realized. In Spain in the 1920s, attempts were made to realize either a communist or an anarchist utopia. But the Spaniards won the outbreak of the civil war of 1936-1939 - they did not give their country to lovers of utopias to set up their experiments.

208

But in any of the Slavic countries, with the happy exception of Poland, at least once there have been attempts to build utopias! Even such a "positive" country, often perceived as boring in this positiveness, like the Czech Republic, was jumping into utopia. This is now the Czech Republic - a philistine and bourgeois country, organically incapable of breakthroughs, risks and tensions. But in the XNUMXth century, the Czech Republic really "jumped" - and "jumped" so much that it almost died altogether.

But the Czech Republic began to develop as a typical country in the center of Europe, and there were no special differences in its social system and economy from the German lands. Even more than that - the level of production in the Czech Republic was higher than in most German lands, and Bohemia! was richer, more cultured, more civilized than many German principalities.

For a long time the country was ruled by the dynasty of Přemyslovichs, descended, according to legend, from a farmer-lander from the village of Stadice, Přemysl. In [X—X!] centuries

The Přemyslids were princes, from the 12th century to the 15th century they were hereditary kings, who very often added German ones to their Slavic possessions. For some time, the Czech Republic paid tribute even to such an extensive and cultural German country as Bavaria. After all, the Czech Republic was one of the richest and most powerful countries in Central Europe.

In 1306 the Přemyslid dynasty came to an end, and in 1310 the Czech lands became part of the possessions of the Dukes of Luxembourg. And not just a "part", but the richest and most valuable possessions, relying on which the dukes of Luxembourg became emperors of the "Holy Roman Empire".

Charles I, governor of Bohemia and Moravia, king of Bohemia from 1333, became emperor of the "Holy Roman Empire" in 1346-1378 under the name of Charles IV.

Under him, the rights of electors were assigned to the Czech kings - that is, those princes who have

1 The word comes from the name of the Celtic tribe Boii. In Latin, the country of the Boii was called Boiohaemum, from where both our Bohemia and the German Bayern come from. — A. B.

209

the right to choose the emperor of the "Holy Roman Empire".

There were very few electors - the bishops of Trier, Mainz and Cologne, the secular princes of Saxony, Brandenburg, the Palatinate and the king of Bohemia. As you can see, the Czech Republic is recognized as one of the most significant countries in the entire German world. And the king of Bohemia turns out to be perhaps the most important of the electors - just because he is a king and, as it were, higher than princes and dukes.

Under Charles I the Archbishopric of Prague was founded (1344), the University of Prague (Charles) was founded (1348), so that, as you can see, the dukes of Luxembourg were not at all temporary workers, striving only to squeeze more out of the Czech Republic. They intended to rule for a long time, settled down for centuries, tried to raise the country, develop it and civilize it even more.

The Czech Republic was ahead of all of Europe in terms of mining developments, in a number of industries. Colored crystal is still called "Bohemian glass". Czech cities were richer and better organized than most German cities. The Czech kings could very well become hereditary emperors of the "Holy Roman Empire" - this was going on.

... And all this was stopped by a phenomenon that in the Soviet

Historiography called it very beautifully: "The Hussite revolutionary movement." According to the Soviet reference book, "The causes of G.r.d. were the strengthening of feudalism. exploitation Czech. peasantry from secular and spiritual feudal lords ... corruption of the Catholic Church, which aroused universal hatred with its wealth and the depravity of the clergy, the ever-increasing German dominance ... the plight of the urban poor (plebs) "".

For the Hussites themselves, religious matters were the most important. In many ways, they raised the questions that would give birth to the Reformation a century, even a century and a half earlier than in the rest of Europe. But the Reformation

1 Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Issue. 3. T. 7. M., 1972. Article "The Hussite revolutionary movement." S. 463.

210

as a pan-European process began in 1517, when Martin Luther nailed his list of 99 questions to the Pope with a dagger on the church door. And in the Czech Republic, Jan Hus was burned as a heretic for about the same thing - new in 1415, a hundred years earlier.

Like all Protestants, the Hussites believed that all people have the right to be priests and denied the privileges of the Catholic Church. They believed that the laity also had the right to conduct church services and take communion "under both their forms" - that is, to partake of both bread and wine, which was considered a privilege of the Catholic clergy (the laity took communion only with bread).

From the very beginning there were two wings in the Hussite movement. Some were called cup-bearers, because the most important thing for them was to partake of wine, like Catholic priests. At the same time, the chashniki also wanted to reform the church, to elect priests by the community, they believed that priests should marry and live like the laity. The same reform of the church was carried out by the same Martin Luther - a hundred years later. In addition, the chashniki wanted the secularization of church lands—that is, to put it simply, they wanted to take its lands away from the church and either put them up for auction, or simply divide them among themselves.

The other wing of the Hussites was called the Taborites. So they called themselves: "the Tabor community", that is, the city of Tabora. The communities in Prague and Pilsen supported the Chasniks, not the Taborites.

The Taborites believed that the end of the world would come very soon, just about, and that before the end of the world it was necessary to create a kingdom of social justice. And how to create it? There is only one way - to wage war with everyone who does not agree with the Taborites. Where the Taborites have already won,

it is necessary to abolish private property, abolish all feudal privileges and distinctions (even those that people would like to keep; for example, the guilds of artisans, to which the townspeople were proud to belong). Some Taborites also wanted to abolish "ownership of women," that is, marriage. In general, the classic is "to divide everything", otherwise there is one in seven rooms, and that borites, you see, are looking for food in the garbage dumps.

211

Like all early Protestants, earthly life was declared a vale of sorrow, and the Hussites knew how to organize it so that ideology was not very at odds with deeds. Forbidden were bright clothes, dancing, fun, entertainment, courtship of young people for girls, secular music, jewelry - all this was declared a manifestation of unrighteousness and sinfulness. The Taborites even had a rule according to which a righteous person had the right to kill an unrighteous and sinful person if he did not retreat from sin. At the same time, what kind of clothing is considered bright, and what exactly is entertainment, was determined, of course, by a "righteous" person.

The killing of the "unrighteous" by the "righteous" was not practiced by the chalices, but they also actively fought against the sinfulness of this world and, saving the parishioners from the hellish flame, easily turned their lives into hell right now, on earth.

In addition to these two gangs ... that is, in the sense of two parties of revolutionaries, there are quite a few quite decent people left in the Czech Republic. If they had grievances against the Catholic Church, they were not sure that the time was right to make them.

The leader of the Catholics was the heir to the Czech throne, Emperor Sigismund [. Pope and Emperor Sigismund [] declared a crusade. Jan Zizka and Prokop defeated the Crusaders. The Pope and the Emperor again convened a crusade... Between 1417 and 1434 there were a total of five crusades. It is known that more than 30 thousand crusaders died, from the "girded knight" to the squire. How many people the crusaders killed in battles, burned alive for the "wrong" faith, taken away as prisoners, maimed and seriously injured, history is silent. We know that some cities are deserted and that in Pilsen, for example, at best 10% of the former population remains.

The Taborites not only slaughtered Chashniki and Catholics - they did this even before the first crusade and not at all in response to the actions of one or the other. To kill everyone who does not share their ideas about the world seemed to them extremely important.

212

The Taborites also organized campaigns to other countries - a kind of retaliatory crusades. They called them "beautiful marches." The Taborite troops carried out a number of "beautiful campaigns" in Silesia, Bavaria, Upper Franconia, Eastern Slovakia and the Baltic Sea.

The preachers of the Taborites reached Pskov and Vn Tebsk, everywhere trying to rouse the people to an uprising, but nowhere did they particularly succeed.

In the USSR, it was officially believed that the Hussite wars were a form of class struggle. They say that the urban plebs and the poorest peasantry followed the taborites, the rich peasants, poor nobles, and part of the artisans followed the bowlers. Well, the richer nobles, merchants and the German part of the townspeople remained Catholics and supporters of the emperor. So to speak, German immigrants. This scheme is clear, like paragraphs of the Charter, and direct, like a police officer's special equipment; using this scheme, as they say, is a pleasure. The only problem is that the poor peasants in many villages supported the Catholics, and the rich merchant Walter Lang (an obvious German) organized Jan Zizka a new way of waging war. (About how Yakov Bruce organized artillery for Peter.) For some reason, this method of warfare is stubbornly attributed to Zizka himself, and German historians sagely talk about how Mongolian steppe methods of warfare broke through in the tactics of the wild Slavs. This really reminds, at first glance, something of the steppe - carts placed in a circle, interconnected, from the circle of which Zizka's soldiers are firing. Only now the carts connected with each other, set in a circle, "for some reason" were called the German word "Wagenburg", that is, "a fortress of wagons", and his associate of Genghis Khan and the obvious Mongol Walter Lang came up with ...

What neither Czechs nor Germans like to remember. Czechs - because they do not want to stain the bright image of the national, purely folk-Czech hero Jan Zizka. Germans because somehow it's embarrassing to find your relative in this terrible brothel with socialized

213

wives. Especially after the claims - we, they say, brought civilization to the Slavs, and they, the damned Mongols, fought back from the Wagenbur ... that is, from the Mongolian carts.

And there are many such stories to tell...

In reality, this was not a class struggle at all, but something incomparably more complex - each party tried to impose its own understanding of the world, its own image on the entire Czech Republic.



life, ideas. It was a conflict of people of the same people and language, but different cultures... Those who jumped headlong into utopia; those who jumped into utopia, but did not want to sink to the end; and those who did not want any utopias at all.

It was an uncompromising, very cruel war, and in twenty years up to 20% of the Czech population, well-established infrastructure, international relations, colossal material values were burned in its fire. From the richest country in the center of Europe, a country that could well become one of the central lands of the "Holy Roman Empire", the Czech Republic has turned into a kind of black hole. Entire armies disappeared without a trace in this hole, and monstrous "beautiful marches" escaped from it, that is, hordes of wild, pathologically cruel and terribly hungry Taborites.

The losses were so unacceptable that the Chashniki already wanted to end the war at any cost. On their initiative, a church council was convened in Basel - maybe it will be possible to come to an agreement? Moreover, in 1424, Jan Zizka died of the plague (Catholics served thanksgiving prayers) and his former associates, as they called themselves, "orphans", became somewhat discouraged - they sincerely considered Jan Zizka an immortal being.

Hopes for an agreement were not justified - at the Basel Church Council, the Taborites, led by Prokop the Great, broke off negotiations and left, stigmatizing heretics - that is, all the rest of humanity, except themselves.

And then the Chashniki teamed up with the Catholics - just to get rid of the Taborites! On May 30, 1434, the most important event for the Czech Republic took place: the decisive defeat of the Taborites at the hands of the Chashniki and Catholics at Lipany. True, another Taborite robber, Jan Rogach

214

from Duba, fought until 1437, when their last fortress of Zion was taken, but everything was already clear.

In devastated Chechnya, covered with ashes, on the ruins of cities, wild dogs gnawed human bones where thousands of families lived happily until recently. Owls called to each other in the once well-maintained entrances to underground mines. Fat wolves in broad daylight went out onto the road, looking appraisingly at people staggering from hunger. The wealth of the country was completely squandered, its international reputation and importance for the pan-European production hopelessly lost. Now Czech youth had incomparably fewer opportunities to study, accumulate wealth, arrange their lives at the level of the best standards of the 15th century ... Incomparably less than their grandfathers and fathers.

But the teapots were in power! On the other hand, they could partake of communion "under both kinds"! The emperor Sigismund did not allow them to plunder the church property, promising a new crusade, but with the freedom of preaching it turned out to be quite "fun" - the cup holders themselves banned the freedom of preaching. In a sense, they forbade the preaching of everything that they themselves considered wrong: both Catholicism and the ideas of the Taborites.

Whether these miserable "conquests" were worth such a number of corpses, such monstrous destruction - one must ask Jan Zizka, Jan Rogach, Prokop the Great and other "great revolutionaries". I, with my sparrow professorial mind, cannot comprehend the greatness of the ideology of the revolutionaries and other "great reformers of society."

But even then the Czech Republic still somehow existed!

Chashniki nominated their king, Jiří Padebrad (sitting on the throne in 1458-1471). He tried to preserve the teachings of the cup-makers, tried to restore the international authority of the Czech Republic: for example, he put forward the idea of uniting the kings of all Europe to fight Turkey. His idea did not have any success - all the more, it was not the advanced and rich, but the impoverished and wild Czech Republic that stood behind him. And who takes the leaders of the poor, wild countries that are not able to deal with themselves?!

215

After him, the Czech Republic elected kings from the Polish Jagiellonian dynasty, and finally elected the Austrian Archduke Ferdinand as king | Habsburg. From that time, from 1526, the Czech Republic actually became part of the Habsburg Empire.

If the "Holy Roman Empire" was considered the heir of the Roman Empire, the heart of the German world that had taken over the baton, then the eastern empire, Ostergesw, Austria, was regarded in the German world as a kind of secondary empire. Something that arose on di

hammered east.

And it turns out that the result of the Hussite wars is also this - from among the leaders of the "Holy Roman Empire" the Czech Republic fell into the vassals of the Austrian Empire ...

But this is not the end! German dominance offended the Czechs, Catholicism was not recognized by yesterday's cup-makers, and a new leap into utopia broke out - the Czech uprising of 1618-1620. It's a paradox - but by its self-murder, the Czech Republic played an important international role! The Czech uprising was the signal for an international conflict that escalated into the Thirty Years' War between Catholics and Protestants - on the scale of the whole of Europe...

But this does not make it any easier for the Czech Republic - on November 8, 1620, the rebels were utterly defeated by the troops of the Habsburgs at the White Mountain.

Before the battle on the White Mountain, the Czech Republic still had its own king and there was no systematic policy of Catholicization and Germanization. Now the Czech Republic does not have its own king, and the policy of Germanization was carried out by the Habsburgs from a position of strength until the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918 ...

After the White Mountain, there comes a period that the Czech historians themselves poetically call - the "period of darkness"; the period when the Czech Republic in general almost turned out to be completely Germanized and almost went into historical non-existence.

So I repeat: the Slavs have a very strange and even frightening predisposition to try to realize various kinds of utopias.

216

Of course, my analogy is not complete, the situation in the Czech Republic of the 15th century and Muscovy in the 15th-17th centuries is not identical. Even if the Slavs are inclined to "jump into utopia" more than other peoples, if the Hussite wars in the Czech Republic open the list of such cases, still something completely different is happening in Muscovy ... For that reason alone. that in Muscovy it is not the whole of society that is "jumping into utopia," but, in essence, one man—the Muscovite tsar. Even if he is the most important here, he is still the only one!

It is the king, not the whole people, who has the problem that makes utopia attractive. Indeed, the rapid development of Muscovy in the 17th century makes the tsar and his courtiers (for now, mostly the tsar!) think: after all, more and more people are becoming independent of the will of the tsar. And then the tsar learns about such a magnificent utopia, so convenient for him, about a "regular state"! It is possible and even necessary to adopt as much as possible from the Europeans, but if you accept the ideas of Puffendorf and Leibniz, then you do not need to live the same way as in Europe! In Europe, according to Wolf, they live just "wrong", and subjects should not be given much freedom. On the contrary, it is necessary to take from the Europeans their technical achievements, but it is necessary to build a "correct", "regular state" and at the same time not to let the subjects go, but, on the contrary, to clamp it even harder than it was under Ivan U. It's impossible otherwise, otherwise the state will turn out to be very "irregular"!

And the "jump into utopia" looks like this - one person "jumps" and drags along the remaining 14 million. How so?! Why is this possible in Muscovy, but in the same Czech Republic it is completely impossible?

How did it happen that the lure of utopia for one turned into a historical dead end for millions of people?

Chapter 4

TWO WORDS ABOUT "PROTECTION AGAINST THE

If you violate these instructions, the manufacturer is not responsible for the consequences ...

Washing machine manual

I have no doubt that the reader who believes me, convinced by the material collected in the book, is ready to unleash the most angry words on Peter. But in the end, Peter has very little to blame for what he did. It is difficult to accuse a person of being who he is. Well, not prepared to rule ... But he was forced, almost forced to be king. Well, ignorant, rude, wild, crazy... But if so, if the tsar deserves all these names, then why are you all obeying him?! Why is a maniac tsar so deadly for Russia?! Indeed, what a strange "jump into utopia" when a country obediently jumps after its king!

In the end, the frankly insane King George 11 sat on the throne of Great Britain ... And the state did not collapse.

George III of the Hanoverian dynasty ruled for almost sixty years ... and what years! He sat on the throne from 1760 to 1820 - just in the era of wars in America, the discoveries of James Cook in the Pacific Ocean, the development of the plantation economy on the islands of the Caribbean archipelago; the development of South Africa, the war with the Marathas and Rajputs in India, the colonization of Australia and New Zealand, and finally, all the Napoleonic wars ... And this is only the

218

new, only the most important, of the events that have taken place in Britain and in her colonies during these fateful sixty years!

The American colonies were freed from the power of the British Empire, and Canada, on the contrary, from a French colony became a British colony. Britain established itself at the extreme tip of Africa, and the Dutch Boer settlers who lived there began to gradually move inland, away from the British military, sailors and officials.

In the same years, the so-called convicts began to be exiled to Australia and thereby marked the beginning of the

war even the south of this smallest of continents. "So called" - because, according to the then British laws, the death penalty was due under 69 articles of the criminal code, including for theft of any property worth more than 6 pence, and for actions that we would now call "petty hooliganism", and the then British law was sometimes called a "threat to the public peace". The very concept of what a "criminal" and "criminal" is is very peculiar in a state where a 20-year-old boy can be sentenced to death for stealing a sheep (worth a shilling, that is, 12 pence), to cook broth for a dying father; where a girl of 16 years old, the daughter of a military officer who died in India, is publicly flogged and sentenced to 25 years hard labor and life exile in Australia. Most of these "convicts" are no more criminal types than the rest of the population of the country, and even if they are guilty of something, then in the smallest degree.

The guy did not ascend the scaffold just because he was sent to Australia (his father, meanwhile, died without having eaten hot food before his death).

And his future wife, a very young girl, an officer's daughter, comes across that, together with two girlfriends, she stole a shawl worth 10 pence from a rich old woman. The girls beg the judges to condescend to them: all three, daughters of quite respectable, but deceased parents, have literally had nothing to eat. They couldn't find

219

ty no work and a few days before the "crime" loitered through the streets without a stake and a yard, without even a piece of bread. "Decent girls work! the jury cuts them off, and their verdict is: "Guilty on all counts!" The judge literally pounces on the girls, knocks on them with his fist and behaves as if the most terrible repeat offenders from all over England were brought to him, and not frightened hungry girls. The only thing that judge and jury argue about is that they stole ten pence and are subject to the death penalty! But, on the other hand, there are three of them ... So, each one stole only three and three tenths of a pence, right? So, it is necessary not to execute, it is necessary to take another punishment. Only this formal logic, and not at all an explanation of their circumstances, saves the girls' lives.

However, in the book of the Danish historian Falk-Rønne! there are many more horror stories.

In Australia, with such "convicts" and with the fruits of their hands, it is approximately the same as with schismatics - in Siberia. The same "miracle" described by Nekrasov: "They gave them freedom and freedom ..." The soils in Australia turned out to be fertile, the grasses were the best suited for sheep and

cows, and in a favorable climate, even real convicts became kinder and smarter.

All these and many other, no less fascinating stories take place in those very sixty years when George 11 "rules" Great Britain. , during the years of his reign in the royal palace they began to celebrate the "black mass", quite seriously worshipping the devil. There are good reasons to believe that even human sacrifices were offered, but this has not yet been proven. But the fact that both Georg 1 and his son and heir, Georg GM, swore by the name of Satan and mocked church rituals in front of many witnesses is a fact.

Towards the end of his days, King Georg of Great Britain! completely out of his mind. In 1811, in connection with

'Falk-Rönne A. Where are you, paradise? M. 1989.  
220

with the insanity of the king, a regency for the Prince of Wales was appointed - from 1820, King George PU, but in 1809-1820 the crazy king sat for himself and sat on the throne.

Captain Bly sailed the seas somewhere, carrying breadfruit sprouts, and Captain Cook discovered island after island, finding dozens of places for the British to establish colonies. The last rebels, peers of the king, lived on Pitcairn Island, and just in 1809 a place was discovered where they managed to hide. But the king himself, the head of the British Empire, over which the sun never sets, he had nothing to do with it. Sometimes he himself did not even really understand what was going on around him and who he was.

With the name of the king, British soldiers went into battle, storming the positions of the namesake of the king, George Washington, and their cry "Long live George!" over the primeval, almost uninhabited forests of America. "In the name of the most Christian King George the Third" the "new" lands were proclaimed the property of the British crown. "For the King and the Fatherland" went into battle "red uniforms" - British soldiers, against the Marathas, Gurkhas and Rajputs. "Redcoats" in hand-to-hand combat mixed with a motley crowd of exotically dressed "natives", artillery fire stopped the howling, raging crowd, rolling in waves from the depths of the Indian subcontinent. In the name of the king, Sir Robert Clive, commander of the troops of the East India Company, declared Bengal part of the British Empire in 1773.

"In the name of the King, George III, I declare this city part of the British Empire!" the major said

Pankburn on the dilapidated artillery, littered with the corpses of Hindus, the wall of the capital of Maharashtra, Sering Patam, in 1799.

In the name of the king, Admiral Nelson sank French ships at Trafalgar and gave orders to the Duke of Wellington at Waterloo. In the same name of the same king, the Maori Linesians on the North Island of New Zealand, who recognized the authority of the empire, killed and ate those who

221

had not yet recognized the authority of George III, but in the Great Lakes of America, the Iroquois slaughtered the Mohicans. King George III was represented by the diplomats of one of the victorious countries at the Congress of Vienna in 1815, doing truly great things on his behalf, redrawing the map of Europe and deciding who should sit on the French throne.

And the king himself, in whose name half the globe was ruled, whose fleet owned the oceans, the half-fool king himself at that time giggled stupidly, looking at a fly on his bedroom window, or asked one of the ministers where they could meet. He was not that stupid or unintelligent person, no ... Georg S was the most natural madman. If he hadn't been born to the papa-king, he would have been imprisoned in a new lunatic asylum, Bedlam. There, according to all the rules of medicine of the XNUMXth century, the santars would pour ice-cold water on his crown, and the doctors would feed him terrible medicines, beating him for refusing to swallow dried wood lice or live sea worms, give him smoke enemas from juniper and read appropriate prayers over him (beating again if he doesn't listen).

Born into the family of the king, George III was spared from such a frightening fate, but, of course, he did not become any smarter or more sane from this. The paradox is that the sixty years of his reign is almost the "finest hour" of the British Empire, the highest point of take-off, or at least a steep exponent, leading directly to this highest, dazzling "point"! The British economy was on a steep rise; it was during these sixty years that the "industrial revolution" took place - machines began to be used in production. One person could now weave as much fabric in one day as several dozen used to weave. A child of eight years old could work where an adult man could hardly manage before. An eerie detail - in many factories they specially used machines adapted to the growth of a child, or they attached boxes to large machines - so that workers of 8-10 years old could reach the working part of the machine.

222

According to the British themselves, the price they paid for the industrial revolution was absolutely horrendous, but there is another side - Britain has overtaken the rest of Europe by at least 30-40 years. It was during the reign of George III that England became the "workshop of the world" - a country that could offer the highest quality manufactured goods and at the lowest prices. The entire economy of Europe ... but what is there! The economy of the whole world turned out to be closed to the British.

Did George W have anything to do with this? No, he didn't have any. Could he hasten the development of the economy in England? No, he couldn't. Maybe he gave some very clever orders, issued laws, created conditions for his subjects to sail the seas with holds full of cheap goods, and return with Hindu fabrics, ivory from Africa, pearls from Polynesia. , timber and flax from Russia, Indonesian spices, metal from South America, whale oil from all over the oceans? No, he did not issue any clever laws, he did not take any decisions of this kind, and, in general, it seems that he did not understand much about economics and politics.

Perhaps George III led the armies and navies of the British Empire? Yes, God save Britain, if George W. could at least something and somewhere "lead"! Of course, he was neither a military leader nor a strong political figure. The country prospered during the years of his reign precisely because George III, with the most ardent desire, could not very much prevent her from flourishing.

The king did not have the rights and opportunities to rule at all?! No, let's not portray George] as a poor king, from whom everything is taken away, except for the royal title; a kind of king Lear of the tenth century. He does not deserve pity, because there is something, and the rights of the king were enormous. To say nothing else, no person in Britain but him would have gotten away with black masses, let alone ritual murders in honor of a good devil friend. And he had the opportunity to rule, to influence the course of events, and absolutely colossal opportunities.

223

Another thing is that the king could not rule without control and without the participation of other people and other forces. Many people imagine the English Parliament as something like the current Russian "talking shop" - the Duma. This is profoundly wrong, because Parliament made laws that were thoughtful, thoughtful, and all of Britain was accustomed to obey these laws. The king could not issue a single law bypassing the parliament, and it turns out that in order to change the "rules of the game" even in the smallest smallness, the king had to convince the House of Lords that he was right, firstly, where



from 600 to 800 titled aristocrats, the highest nobility of the country, sat. These people remembered well both their own interests and the interests of the state, and very many of them were educated, experienced and intelligent.

Secondly, the king would have to convince the members of the House of Commons of his right, that is, from 800 to 1000 professional politicians who were authorized by their electors and to whom these politicians had a very real responsibility.

That is, wanting to change the laws or introduce some new decree, the king had to not just take and order, or even order in writing, as Peter did when he wrote another empty decree. He had to convince his subjects of something, to seek agreement and common ground.

But the king could not act in circumvention of the law, or at least almost could not. His ability to command and enforce obedience in defiance of the law in any political setting remained very limited. To put it simply, even the king could not do absolutely everything he wanted. Even "black masses" Georg III served secretly, and Peter's "antichrist" behavior is open | was completely out of reach for him.

Because in Britain, in addition to Parliament, there were powerful state institutions such as the Admiralty or the Ministry of the Colonies, which disposed of both serious armed force and huge material resources. These departments were headed by people who were educated, smart, and cunning. These people - the highest dignitaries of the country - possessed considerable wealth.

224

niyami and already therefore turned out to be weakly dependent on the authorities ... including the royal power. And the range of power that the admirals from the Admiralty had at their disposal would be envied not only by any associate of Peter, but also by any employee of his father - any boyar Boris Ivanovich Morozov or a дума clerk Artamon Sergeevich Matveev, although they had more subordinates, and the range of power wider. If necessary, they, the highest officials, could unite with each other, and with the parliament, and with any other political force ... including against the king.

In a word, different public and state institutions, different groups of people and different institutions collided in British politics. No one had the absolute right to speak on behalf of everyone or on behalf of some higher truth, and the king was only ONLY ONE OF THE FORCES IN THIS FIELD.

By the way, in this the king of Great Britain does not

so very different from his Russian counterpart, the Muscovite tsar, Alexei Mikhailovich Romanov. And Aleksey Mikhailovich was limited in his power - if not by written laws, but by unwritten traditions, he could not do everything that he could think of.

In the same way, in the field of Russian politics in the 18th century, the interests of large feudal lords, different classes of society and different state structures (orders, the Boyar Duma, and so on) clashed. The general trend of development was precisely in the gradual weakening of tradition, in its replacement by laws, in an ever more subtle and complex limitation of the power of kings.

Aleksey Mikhailovich is even more pleasant than Georg 11, as in general an intelligent and educated person is more pleasant than a crazy and foolish person, and a decent God-fearing family is more attractive than a Satanist obsessed with the mania of destruction.

If we return to George III, then this is essentially important: in reality, the king, in order to carry out his policy, could only negotiate with other forces, convince them to help him ... or intrigue, put "his people"

225

to key places. For example, in 1762 (George III did not have time to come to power), the Whig government, which was actually controlled by William Pitt Sr., replaced the government of the royal favorite J. Bute, and later, until the early 1780s, the government was headed by the king's henchmen. .

Some scientists, by the way, attribute the failures during the war with the United States to this: in their opinion, more reasonable politicians could either prevent the war altogether, make reasonable concessions in time. Or break up the barely formed coalition of states, divide them into allied and hostile states, and gradually strangle these hostile states and force them to surrender - both by the forces of Britain itself and by the forces of

union states.

Not to mention the fact that military operations could be conducted on a completely different level. After all, the British government could not understand for a very long time that in America there was not just a local rebellion that could be suppressed by the forces of hired soldiers bought in a natural way in the German Duchy of Hesse. The United States of America has staged a quite serious revolution, and the exertion of all forces is necessary, the urgent dispatch of all elite troops to America.

If this opinion is correct, it turns out that Georg III still managed to inflict great

venous harm. But even in this case, such harm could be incomparably greater; say, the Prut campaign of Peter I obviously brought Russia incomparably more trouble than the war lost in America - Britain. In general, the reign of the mad king is very small ... compared with Russia, it has simply amazingly little effect on the achievements of Britain during the 60 years of the reign of George I.

It turns out that the market economy of Britain, the corporate system of government and the parliamentary system provide the most powerful "protection against a fool." Well, of course, if the king is smart and talented; such a king can greatly help his country and do much good for it. But even if the king is not a particularly prominent lich

226

ness, and even if he is not at all capable of ruling the country, that's okay! All the same, the industrial revolution is going on, all the same, the surplus population is being thrown out of the country, dispersed across New Zealand, Australia and South Africa; all the same, British ships ply all the oceans of the planet, and the roar of British cannons marks the advent of a new era for the dark-skinned monasteries of Africa and the East - British colonialism.

And the king?! What is a king? Let him sit in the Palace of Westminster and show himself less in public. Does he play the role of a symbol of the nation? The one in whose name cities are taken and battles won? Well, let him play for himself, it's not worse for anyone, and in general - there are symbols even more disgusting.

It is very likely that if the same system existed in Muscovy in 1689 as in Great Britain in 1760, Peter and the entire Naryshkin clan behind him would not be so dangerous at all. If the tsar's actions were supported by other political forces, he would have full opportunity to pursue the policy he needed. If not, "protection from a fool" is turned on, after which Peter could sit and write his 20 thousand decrees ... yes, even 200 thousand - who feels bad for this, if none of his decrees can to destroy the peasant production of linen, or to destroy 3,000 archers?! Let him write it, after all, anyway, any decree will become binding only when the Boyar Duma "sentences" it, recognizes the patriarch, when the clerks of the most important orders agree with its content ...

Probably, even in Rus', a sovereign who was not particularly sane could sit on the throne, if only he did not particularly interfere with society to do what the time had come. Yes, by the way, we had such a king! Tsar Fyodor Ivanovich, the son of Ivan the Terrible, was frankly insane.

It is not easy to determine the degree of his irresponsibility in hindsight, because the worse people treated both the country headed by the monarch and the monarch himself, the more and with the more colorful details they are inclined to talk about his mental illness. But, in lu

227

In any case, Fyodor Ivanovich was a quiet man, not inclined to interfere with anyone in anything, and the country really went where it went, without special guidance from the tsar. |

It is very possible that if Naryshkina's son had turned out to be the same quiet, colorless fool, he, under certain circumstances, might not have had a special impact on the course of events. Even though "protection from a fool" was not in the Russian political tradition, what to do!

In general, it turns out a rather gloomy picture. The progressive development of the country has been going on for almost a whole century. Much has been achieved, the country has almost become a part of Europe. The state is flourishing, it is on the rise.

... And all this flies into the abyss only because the not quite sane "tsarevich of the second freshness" is on the throne. First, it's humanly offensive. Secondly, it would still be nice to understand why all this is happening. |

It turns out that the fate of the country does not depend on the will of its people, not on the successes achieved in various spheres of life, not on laws that have already been written. No! The state and the people entrust themselves to one person - the monarch. His power is so immense that he can abolish laws or ignore them, and can with extraordinary ease destroy everything that generations have accumulated.

And the rest of the population is so disenfranchised that there are absolutely no mechanisms to stop the dangerous maniac on the throne.

Just don't think that it was only in Europe that a madman could sit on the throne and do comparatively little harm. And in the East there were quite a few bizarre rulers. During the years of the reign of many of them, quite independently of the will of the ruler, the country reached its economic, political or cultural prosperity.

Take, for example, the Muslim caliph Hakim of the Fatimid dynasty (reigned 996-1021). The Fatimids, who traced their clan to the daughter of Muhammad Fatima, created

228

they gave a powerful state in which secular power was combined with religious power, and they made Cairo their capital.

Caliph Hakim was somewhat reminiscent of Peter, already in that, issuing even the most idiotic decree, he always tried to explain why all this was necessary. For example, Hakim told women never to leave their homes "because they don't need to at all" and told his subjects to sleep during the day and stay awake at night. After all, it's cooler at night and it's more pleasant to live and work ...

So he had fun for almost a quarter of a century, and then Hakim somehow gathered the courtiers and clearly explained to them that neither they, the nobility of the Fatimid Caliphate, nor the rest of the Muslim people were worthy of such a ruler as Hakim. He explained, shook his head sadly, and then ... sat on a donkey and left in an unknown direction. Where the former caliph went, what he did, where he laid down his bones - history is silent. Both from Egypt and from the history of the Muslim world, Hakim disappeared completely without a trace; as is customary to say on such occasions, "no one ever saw him again." One can only guess whether one of the subjects, who were somewhat tired of staying awake at night, settled accounts with him, or whether for several decades an old beggar, who simply had no one to identify, sat somewhere near a reservoir in Medina or Mecca. former caliph... Nothing is known, and therefore everything is possible.

But no matter how swagger Hakim was, the caliphate was under him at the height of his power and glory! Far away was the day when the Fatimids owned only a small part of North Afrini, and just as far away is another day - when Sicily and Algeria fall away from the caliphate, and the Syrian feudal lord Salah ad-Din raises an uprising against them and the Fatimid state ends its existence.

nie...

No less strange was Peter's contemporary, the Japanese shogun Tsunayoshi Tokugawa, the fifth shogun in the Tokugawa dynasty, nicknamed the "dog shogun" (inu shogun). He ruled in 1680-1709 and "became famous" for a series of decrees, which also subtly resembled Peter

229

sky: both with their voluntarism and incredible artificiality.

Shogun Tsunayoshi took care of and protected animals from all kinds of offenses, primarily dogs ... He did this because once a Buddhist monk explained to Tsunayoshi that his lack of male offspring was due to sins committed in past lives - in these

In past lives, he destroyed many living beings.

Since Tsunayoshi was born in the year of the Dog, which is 12 years old, he decided to devote most of his attention to dogs. In 1687, "dog decrees" rained down on poor Japan - up to twenty in total (also similar to Peter). The subjects of the shogun were not to kill, beat, scare dogs, deny them food or the right to enter their home. Even addressing a dog or talking about a dog had to be done in certain polite ways. Not just any "Inu" - a dog. And respectfully - o-inu-sama, which can be translated something like this: "dear lady dog."

It is difficult to say to what extent Japan complied with "the dog whose decrees." In any case, the inhabitants of the city of Edo, the "eastern capital" (in Japanese, Tokyo, which later became the official name of the city - Tokyo), were so unhappy that in 1695 the city authorities of Edo organized a kennel for 50,000 dogs. It is not difficult to understand the local authorities - and they cannot disobey Tsunayoshi's instructions, and they cannot ignore the opinion of the people. The authorities in Edo are trying to both comply with the "dog decrees" and at the same time remove the dogs from the city, thereby easing the discontent.

In 1709, as soon as Tsunayoshi died, all his "dog whose decrees" were immediately canceled by his successors, and the "dog shogun" went down in history as a kind of walking living anecdote.

But just during the reign of the strange Tsunayoshi, Japanese culture takes off! As if specifically to show that there is no special regularity, the talents of the ruler and the flowering of his country are not directly connected ... Or is "protection from a fool" again here?

230

In the history of Japan, great importance is attached to the "Genroku years" - 1688-1703: this is the time of the maximum take-off of urban culture. The time when phenomena arose that are very similar to the culture of the New Age in Europe. This is the time when the kabuki theater appeared, designed for the city dwellers, moreover, for the democratic strata of the population and their unassuming tastes.

This is the era of the writer Ihara Saikaku (1642-1693), the founder of Japanese urban literature, the creator of a whole series of adventure novels. His stories from the life of the townspeople opened up a whole trend in Japanese literature, called "ukiyo-zoshi" - "stories about the vain life."

This is the era of Matsuo Basho (1644-1694), the master of the Japanese haiku 3-line, and the playwright Mozaemon Chika-

matsu (1653-1724), whose plays are still staged today. This is the time when the artist Korin Ogata (1658-1716), the predecessor and teacher of Kitagawa with his portraits, and Hokusai Katsushika with his poignant views of Mount Fuji and the famous "Wave" lived.

We have to admit - and here the country lived on its own, and its ruler Shogun Tsunayoshi lived on its own, in its own dimensions.

Chapter 5

#### COMPANIONS OF THE ANTICHRIST

Everyone chooses for himself a Woman,  
a religion, a road. To serve the devil or the  
prophet, Everyone chooses for himself.

Y. Levitansky

Well, okay ... Even if on the throne of Muscovy, and since 1721 - the Russian Empire, either the Tsar-Anti-Christ was sitting, or simply crazy. But, in the end, no matter how disenfranchised his subjects were, no matter how forced they were to obey the terrible creature that occupied the throne ... but now he died. Why not lead ... well, at least try to lead the country out of the impasse into which Peter the Great drove it? It is most convenient to do this for those whom

Peter promoted to the main roles in the state, made the largest bosses and who remained after him the most influential people, holders of the greatest power. In the end, Stalin's "cult of personality" and "unjustified repressions" were "exposed" by none other than N.S. Khrushchev is one of the closest associates of the tyrant, personally guilty of the murder of several million people in Ukraine, in the course of "collectivization". If the state has already found itself in a dead end, it must be out of it

get out sooner or later. So, the companions  
of the Antichrist king...

232

Since childhood, each of us has heard about the associates of Peter: Menshikov, Apraksin, Tolstoy, Yaguzhinsky, Romodanovsky. An old legend says that "Peter's companions" were like one, "thin" and they were opposed

"conservative boyars". But even of these named, all except Menshikov are descendants of ancient families, old and noble nobility.

V.V. Mavrodin distinguishes two groups of the highest nobility under Peter more streamlined: if one group consisted of people for whom being near the throne is a hereditary affair (Fyodor Yuryevich Romodanovsky, Boris and Dmitry Golitsyn, N.I. Repnin, the entire Dolgoruky clan; to this Yakov Vilimovich Bruce also joined the group), then the second - from the nobles "although titled, but for the most part not well-born, not of noble origin." "They owed their titles and ranks, their wealth and influence, their place in society, in short, everything, to Peter". These are Alexander Danilovich Menshikov, Gavril Ivanovich Golovkin, Pyotr Andreevich Tolstoy, Fyodor Matveevich Apraksin, Ivan Ivanovich Buturlin, Pavel Ivanovich Yaguzhinsky.

One can already agree with such an interpretation, but one must certainly add to it: exactly the same groups consisted of the courtiers of Alexei Mikhailovich, and, of course, Fyodor Alekseevich. Approximation to the court of capable and trustworthy nobles is a tradition in Muscovy throughout the 18th century. The question is, whom the tsar puts forward and brings closer to himself.

"Peter, despite his youth and the amusing nature of his occupation, has already managed to attract the best forces from the society around him, to take the best people who were distinguished by some kind of ability"?, S.M. Solovyov.

Probably, among these "best people" he is ready to call Franz Lefort ... A figure as sinister as it is mysterious. The origin of Lefort is covered

^ Mavrodin V.V. The birth of a new Russia. L., 1988. S. 345.

2 Soloviev S.M. History of Russia since ancient times. UP book. M., 1962. S. 473.

233

darkness. They called him a Frenchman, and a Dutchman, and a baptized Jew, but no one could show the house where Franz Lefort was born and name his parents. He seems to be from Geneva, from a family of local merchants... In Geneva they even show the house where he was born...

But there are at least two more versions of the place of his birth. As for the origin from the townspeople - the version seems to be confirmed, but everything is also rather unsteady. Speaking in the spirit of the Strugatsky brothers, Lefort should be called "a man without any



past." This is the best candidate for an agent of the Judeo Masons, who carried out the task of his order to solder and corrupt the king. With some imagination, one can consider Lefort and an alien thrown from the Coma of Veronica or the Magellanic Cloud to do some bad deeds on Earth.

Lefort emerges in 1675 when he arrives in Muscovy. According to him, he had previously served in the French and Dutch armies, but his colleagues are unknown, and there is no one to confirm this. In any case, he began to serve in the Moscow army only in 1678. Despite participation in the campaign against Turkey, in the Crimean campaigns V. Golitsyn remains a captain. Only Peter made him a general after half a year or a year of acquaintance.

"...a man of amusing and luxurious, or call debo chan french. And he constantly gave dinners, soups (dinners. - A. B.) and balls at his place. And right there in his house, the first beginning began, that his royal majesty began to treat foreign ladies and cupid began to be with the first one, with one merchant's daughter, named Anna Ivanovna Monsova ... Immediately in Lefort's house, debauchery began, such drunkenness great that cannot be described, and that many have died because of it. And from that time until now, drunkenness continues, and between the great houses it has come into fashion. The aforementioned Lefort from that time came to such a degree that he was made an infantry general, and then an admiral, and died of drunkenness. This is how Boris Ivanovich Kurakin characterizes Lefort.

234

So, a drunkard and a pimp who managed to charm Peter, who was just at the turning point from adolescence to youth ... Let's add to that - bisexual, that is, a person who willingly made love to both men and women. There is a version that it was he who hunted Peter for pederasty.

And, of course, a very, very squeamish person... A most active participant in the All-Drunken Council, who even tried to "improve" the outrage that was happening, a lover of several other associates of Peter (including Menshikov) and, at the same time, of many ladies.

No information has been preserved about the military talents and exploits of Lefort. Either he, plus everything, was also a man of incredible modesty and hid his exploits, or still there were no such talents and exploits.

That's what has been preserved, so it's rather unpleasant rumors about Lefort's connections with evil spirits. Atheists in this place can start laughing, it's up to them. But here's one

a story related to Lefort: they say, a few days before his death, in the dead of night, an incredible noise was heard in Lefort's bedroom. The servants ran in and saw no one and nothing. But the noise in the bedroom continued, among other things - deep, very strong sighs (or sounds that others understood as sighs? Who knows). And the next morning all the armchairs and chairs in the bedroom were overturned and scattered on the floor. All this was seen and heard by many people, so it is difficult to doubt the veracity of the story, in general.

There is another story connected with the death of Franz Lefort. He died (whether 43 or 44 years old) as he liked, but not in a Christian way. He drove the priest away from him and at the last hour demanded wine, de wok-dancers and musicians. The musicians began to play, the girls danced, and under all this fun, Franz Lefort drank wine until the agony began. Many people were present with her, because Franz Lefort ordered no one to stop playing and dancing while he was alive. And many saw how the corpse of Lefort with a green bared face fell off the bed, began to write out dance steps, raised his hand

235

ki ... And at the same moment when the corpse jumped off and danced, a wild whistle was heard, a many-voiced hoot from the attic and from under the floor of the Lefort Palace.

You can believe or not believe these testimonies, but many have seen it, and the question arises - so after all, who ... who exactly was roaming around the All-Drunken Cathedral ?!

Lefort, of course, is a most colorful personality; as if a person set out to gather in himself absolutely all the qualities that make him dangerous for any enthusiastic  
them young men.

But after all, F.Yu. Romodanovsky, according to the same B.I. Kurakin, "looking like a monster, an evil tyrant in disposition, a great undesirer of good for anyone, drunk all day, but he was faithful to his majesty like no other" - this is also a colorful and creepy type. Interestingly, creatures from another world never came for him?! It seems that there is no data, but it does not at all follow that they never came.

And what about "the most land-based admiral in the world" Apraksin? And what about the pathologically thievish Menshikov, who neatly shared all his mistresses with Peter and was himself one of them? And what about Nikita Zotov, who turned from the first teacher into a jester? And the insignificantly cheerful Lev Kirillovich? All of them, perhaps, are not as bright, colorful as Le Fort, but they all have at least three common qualities that make them related to Le Fort.

One of these qualities is understandable, and it is really necessary for any courtier, at all times: it is devotion to the monarch, in this case, Peter. As is usually the case with courtiers, love and devotion to the monarch are by no means necessarily disinterested... In this regard, representatives of ancient families, rich people, are the most reliable. They, of course, also get their piece of the pie, but people like Romo Danovsky or Golitsyn still do not have such an urgent need for a court career. Even resignation for them is not such a catastrophe after all. Knowing such as Menshikov or Lefort, devotion to the monarch may well be sincere enough ... why not?

236

The second common feature is binge drinking. In the company of Peter there were never not only teetotalers, but in general people who were moderate in drinking. Peter did not tolerate people who knew how to "know the measure", who did not lose their heads and preserved their own dignity in drunkenness, and not a single such person made a career during the years of his reign. All of the above - that is, the "best people" singled out and brought closer to themselves by Peter back in Preobrazhensky - these are people who drank constantly and to the point of a swine, drunken and violent jesters.

The third common feature is the most perfect personal nothingness. Everyone whom Peter brought closer to himself, all "with their titles and ranks, their wealth and influence, their place in society, in short, everything" owe only to Peter, people are exceptionally gray, not interesting, not bright and not active. Lefort still stands out as a kind of bearer of active evil, a destructive principle, a large personality, even if in a fall, in disintegration... But before meeting Peter, he too wore a very modest for him

years of the rank of captain.

Even the monstrously cruel, capable of actually manually torturing Romodanovsky, is not very bright personally. His ability to harm people stems from the position that Peter gave him, and not from his personal qualities. It is completely incomprehensible whether Romodanovsky himself, without the help of Peter, could become at least a clerk or even an ordinary executioner in the department that he headed?

Who would be the completely illiterate Menshikov, with difficulty depicting his own signature, if he had not fallen on his life path with a rare luck named Peter? Who would they be, and those who later got into his personal company and made an excellent career: the hysterical Pavel Yaguzhinsky, Pyotr Tolstoy, who took such an active part in the Khovanshchina, the sly THY "to amazement" Shafirov, the man-machine Makarov so empty that there is literally nothing to say about it? What fate would have awaited them if they had not pursued their careers

Tsar Peter?

237

The wretchedness of those whom Peter nominated for the first roles was most strikingly affected as soon as he closed his eyes. Those representatives of the ancient families, whom he did not like to such an extent, could well exist without him, and after him: at least the fate of the Dolgoruky and Golitsyn, who still exist and cannot be said to be very poor, can guarantee this.

And what about Peter's nominees, who owe everything to him alone?

"... Employees of the reform involuntarily, these people were not sincere adherents of it in their souls, they did not so much support it as they themselves held on to it, because it gave them an advantageous position ... The idea of the fatherland was for his servants (Peter's servants - A. B.) is too tall, not for their civil stature. The people closest to Peter would not be leaders of the reform, but his personal courtyard people. He sometimes beat them, sometimes he was ready to see them as his co-workers, in order to ease the feeling of boredom with his autocratic loneliness. ... Here are the most influential people in whose hands the fate of Russia found itself at the moment of Peter's death. They started fooling around in Russia immediately after the death of the reformer... The severe will of the reformer united these people with the specter of some common cause. But when in the face of Catherine | a fetish of power appeared on the throne, they felt themselves to be themselves and took a sober look at their mutual relations, as well as at their position in the ruled country: they hated each other like old friends, and began to trade Russia as their booty. No important work could be done without giving them a bribe; all of them were given an exact price on the condition that none of them knew how much the other got. These were the true children of the fiscal-police state that had brought them up, with its arbitrariness, its contempt for the rule of law and the human person, with a dulling of moral sense. ... These people had neither the strength nor the desire to continue or destroy the work of Peter; they could only spoil it. Under Peter, having become accustomed to following his strict instructions, they seemed to be large quantities, but now, left alone, they turned out to be simple zeros that had lost their

238

its leading unit. It used to happen that they would agree on an important matter, but Osterman, without whom the Russian court could not take a step, would break in order to inflate his own worth, and would not come. Having dissuaded any of his political illnesses. The arbiters of domestic destinies will not sit for a long time and, having drunk a glass, will disperse, and then

huddle around the baron to disperse the bad mood of the St. Petersburg Mephistopheles from Westphalia. But in the face of Osterman, they did not honor either intelligence, or knowledge, or hard work, despised him as a stranger, feared him as an intriguer, and hated him as a rival.

In a word, "how meager were the educational means created by the reform, how unreliable were the businessmen selected by Peter, to whom he could bequeath the continuation of his business, how little sympathy he attracted to his cause among the people and even in high society"?

I allow myself to agree with V.O. Klyuchevsky in everything except one thing: it is not very clear whether there was a notorious reform, and with it a common cause? However, I will leave it to the reader to figure it out for himself: did the state "dealers" closest to Peter turn into such nonentities after his death (in this case, it turns out that under Peter they were one people, and after Peter there were others). Or they have always been like that, and the words of S.M. Soloviev about the choice of "the best people" sound like a bad laugh.

In any case, from February 1725, before Peter's corpse had cooled down, they turned out to be ... what they turned out to be. It is terrible to imagine what these people were turned into, in the words of N.I. Pavlenko, "terrible laws of the struggle for power"! I will give two examples from the life of Menshikov and those closest to him.

...Anna Danilovna, the sister of the "Highest Prince", entered into a stormy romance with Anton Devier, St. Petersburg

1 Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 3. Rostov-on-Don, 2000. S. 117-120.

2 Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 3. Rostov-on-Don, 2000. S. 121.

239

governor, and wanted to marry him. It is not known to whom Menshikov was going to marry his sister, but, in any case, he did not consider Devier his equal and "deigned to be angry" with his sister. The anger of the "highest lord" reached its limit when Anton Devier came to him to ask for the hand of his sister ... Menshikov ordered Devier to be whipped right there, which was done, and ordered the servants to kick him in the neck (in the middle of the city, which was ruled by Anton Manuilovich Devier) .

Let's be fair: Devier acted exceptionally impudently, declaring that, of course, Menshikov had the right to refuse him, but then the "Highest Prince of Izhora" was

it is worth becoming the uncle of an illegitimate baby ... And after the insult inflicted on him, Devier also acted very decisively: he ran to complain to the king. Peter, however, decided the case in his favor and ordered Menshikov to marry his sister to Devier.

According to the general opinion, Menshikov did not like Devier, did not consider himself an equal, and after this story he disliked even more. The Menshikovs never had Deviers, and Menshikov broke off all relations even with his sister Anna.

Nov 1722-1723 Menshikov's position was shaken, he became in dire need of support. It was then that he suddenly kindled with kindred feelings for the Deviers, began to resort to the help of his son-in-law and even fawned over him. In January 1722, Alexander Menshikov asked Anton Manuilovich "to inform us about everything, about which we are trustworthy at your mercy."

In March 1722 Menshikov burst into congratulations on the occasion of the birth of his nephew, named after him Alexander. The longest message ends with the following passage: "On this solemn holiday, with all your surname, send in all integrity the health of your and your newborn son, our dear nephew."

In February 1723, Menshikov's new, very delicate request to Devier was to inform him of the assessment received from the tsar of the construction work, which he, Menshikov, supervised.

240

Undoubtedly, Menshikov had many spies, but he also needed a son-in-law during this period of his life and forgot about his hostility ... while he needed Devier. And Anna Danilovna during this period again began to enter her brother's house!

Back in 1727, Devier reported to Menshikov about the careless words of A.V. Makarova: they say that Menshikov wants to become related to the ruling dynasty, "climbing the throne." During the reign of Catherine Menshikov was incomparably more powerful than in any period of Peter's life: a kind of illegal emperor! It was not a problem for him to abolish the Cabinet, after which Makarov was transferred to a much smaller position: he was appointed President of the Chamber

Legia.

But as soon as Menshikov ceased to need Devier, a heavy blow immediately fell on the "offender of honor" of Menshikov's sister: with the direct participation of Menshikov, Devier was accused of abuse, and in May 1727 Anton Manuilovich was exiled to Siberia after being whipped. And Menshikov's own sister Anna - to settle in one of her villages, and since then

Since then, he has never seen her.

I leave it to the reader to judge what we are dealing with here: with the viciousness of an experienced intriguer who always craved Devier's blood, but managed to postpone revenge until better times, or with the usual indifference of a courtier to the fate of an "already unnecessary employee." And who did not pay attention to family ties with the disgraced son-in-law, discarded like rags.

The second story is perhaps even more poignant.

It all started with the fact that Shafirov gave a salary to his brother Mikhail ... A salary to which Mikhail did not have the slightest right. Shafirov created such a frank lawlessness that the showdown began with the Senate itself. Shafirov should have confessed, and then the story would not have become the subject of a noisy trial, but he, as they say, "carried away." Some were "for" Shafirov, others were against it, and in the Senate, exactly as before in the Boyar Duma, two groups arose - not so much anymore.

241

and remembering what caused the fuss to flare up. Each group fought with the other not at all for the idea of justice, but only to devour others - their competitors for material wealth and influence.

The Chief Prosecutor of the Senate, Grigory Grigoryevich Skornyakov-Pisarev, was in the Menshikov group and scolded Shafirov, relying on this acquaintance.

And Shafirov acted together with D.M. Golitsyn. Already this alignment, when the rootless cross Shafirov acted together with Prince Golitsyn, and Menshikov - with the pillar nobleman Skornyakov-Pisarev, is enough to refute the version of the struggle between the "old" nobility and new nominees. In this and in all other cases, the division into "parties" proceeded according to completely different principles.

These squabbles in the Senate began so many times that, in the end, they decided to postpone the matter until Peter returned to St. Petersburg from the Caspian campaign. But even without discussing the "incorrectly issued" money, the parties clashed all the time, for absolutely any reason.

On October 31, 1722, Shafirov was asked to go out while discussing the situation with the mail. It was quite correct, because the mail was in his charge, and you never know what accusations could be made against him? Shafirov refused to come out, shouting curses and accusations against all those present.

You are my main enemy and thief! - he shouted, among other things, to Skornyakov-Pisarev.

Menshikov, Golovin and Bruce, after consulting whether to decide to leave the Senate:

- When the chief prosecutor is a thief in the Senate, how can we improve things at the same time?

Behind them went away and the chief prosecutor

Shafirov should have stopped here, stopped yelling, but he had already completely lost his temper, lost self-control and yelled:

- In vain you are angry with me and send me out. You are all my main enemies. His Serene Highness Prince - for the Pochep case, and I gave che to Chancellor Count Golovin

242

lobby to the sovereign himself. That's why they shouldn't be condemned in the Senate either.

- Don't kill me! - Menshikov threw a remark.

- You'll kill everyone! - retorted Shafirov. - Only I am for you, like Volkonsky and Prince Matvey Gagarin, if I don't put on a noose

With these words, Shafirov commemorated the embezzlement of Prince Gagarin, to whom Menshikov had a direct relationship; then the investigation of abuses was conducted by Prince Grigory Volkonsky: very biased, in favor of Menshikov. Both Gagarin and Volkonsky, accused of indulging a criminal, were executed, but Menshikov, an accomplice in both crimes - both embezzlement and its concealment - got away with it.

These words turned out to be fatal for Shafirov - Menshikov remembered them and began to fight for real, using all his influence to destroy Pyotr Pavlovich.

On January 9, 1723, Peter, returning to Moscow, created the "Supreme Court" to consider the case of Shafirov. The court was, of course, under the complete influence of Menshikov.

The chamber junker Berchholtz described the execution of Shafirov on February 15, 1723:

"After they took off his wig and old fur coat and took him to an elevated scaffold, where, according to Russian custom, he turned his face to the church and crossed himself several times, then knelt down and laid his head on the chopping block; but the executioner's servants stretched out his legs, so that he had to lie on his fat belly. Then the executioner raised a large ax up, then hit it near, on the chopping block - and then Makarov, on behalf of the emperor, announced,



that the criminal, in respect of his merits, is granted LIFE.

The senators congratulated Shafirov in every possible way on the pardon, but he himself could hardly stand on his feet and said that it would be better to immediately "open a big vein" in order to "get rid of the torment at once." For two years Shafirov lived with his family in Novgorod in poverty, and only Catherine returned him and allowed him to court.

243

So, Shafirov, who was entirely obliged to Menshikov for being on the scaffold, again met in St. with Menshikov!

On May 3, 1735, Campredon wrote to Paris: "Baron Shafirov, who has become very close to Prince Menshikov, whom he now follows with his advice, begins to enjoy some confidence in the queen."

"A friend who competed for power became a bitter enemy; it was not customary to give a helping hand to a friend in trouble; attachments changed with the same ease with which the situation at court, generated by intrigues, changed ... One gets the impression that these people were deprived of ordinary human feelings, that all their actions were guided by career considerations that took precedence over attachments, loyalty to friendship willingness to give up something for the sake of the neighbor.

I told two piquant stories about Menshikov... and before that, I told how Menshikov killed Andrei Andreevich Vinius. If you set yourself the goal of telling all such cases, you will have to write a whole library! But it will not be interesting to read it - in addition to purely external signs, the same thing is repeated - a primitive "undercover" struggle, a brutally brutal struggle for power, influence, the right to dispose and command

wat.

In the name of this struggle, human relations and, of course, the interests of the state are brought. It is difficult to find in it the behavior of statesmen, associates of the Great Reformer. Everything that we know about these people testifies: no matter who Peter was for Russia, no matter what he changed and reformed, no matter what he "raised on his hind legs" - there were neither associates nor like-minded people in the people around him! There were lackeys surrounding the throne, opportunists and loafers, pursuing only their own selfish goals.

It is no coincidence that in the last years of his life, Peter was so lonely. It is no coincidence that after Poltava Peter

1 Pavlenko N.I. Semi-ruler. M., 1991.S..323.

244

more and more pushed Menshikov away from him; their close relationship was completely left in the past, and Menshikov even fell under investigation.

According to such serious historians as V.V. Mav Rodin and N.I. Pavlenko, had Peter lived a few years longer, Menshikov would have shared the fate of Shafirov, and very possibly the chief fiscal Nesterov, the wheel of the bathroom for unimaginable theft (among other things, he appropriated the diamonds sent to Catherine).

Surely it would not be easy for Peter to make such a decision; after all, the thief and petty intriguer was not a stranger to him. It was the same Aleksashka, Alexander Menshikov, with whom they went to Kukuys to Anna Mons and Lefort, who climbed the walls of Azov and Narva in puffs of powder smoke, chopped with axes and tortured archers, knew the secrets of the fake "streltsy conspiracy", the origin of Catherine and the death of Tsarevich Alexei (if only he would be a consultant for this book!).

A lot of things in the fate of Menshikov can be frankly explained precisely by the fact that for Peter, for all his unreliability and thieving, he remained "that very Aleksash KOY." But in his last years, Peter saw too clearly that the closest friend of his youth, the most trusted person who remained in his life after Lefort, was not an associate or like-minded in everything. And that Menshikov followed him not in order to accomplish some great historical deeds, not even out of love for him, Peter, but always had simple and clear goals: to ascend higher, to steal more.

Without talking about any moral concepts, it is not worth explaining who Shafirov and Menshikov, Lefort and Apraksin are from the point of view of both the laws and the most elementary morality of a civilized society. Firstly, there is not the slightest need for this: everything is already very clear, and even more so there is no need for moralizing, for waving an upraised finger. And secondly, my old-fashionedness is to blame: I don't know how to analyze the behavior of the rabble, which belongs in a jail or in the Garbage Yard.

Chapter 6

EXCEPTION FROM THE RULES

However, among the closest associates of Peter

there was one person of a completely different flight. It seems to be one of his team, and quite typical - a serving foreigner, the grandson of the nobles who moved from Scotland, Yakov Vilimovich Bruce. Another grandfather of Yakov Vilimovich came to Russia in 1647. After the defeat at Marston Moor, the Parliamentarians not only conquered and occupied the country, they harassed the Scottish nobles as best they could. Dozens, hundreds of relatives and friends of William Bruce died in battles and on the chopping block, hid in the mountains or left for other countries. There is a legend that William was advised to go to Muscovy by an old friend of his father, General Dalzell: he visited Muscovy during the Time of Troubles, served in Muscovy for eight years and knew the country firsthand.

The Bruces were distantly related to Robert the Bruce, who in 1314 defeated the English troops at Bannockburn, defeated the pro-English party of John at Baliol, and became king of Scotland. In 1328 he forced England to sign a peace treaty recognizing the independence of Scotland. From the end of the 20th century, the Stuarts sat on the Scottish throne, but, as they said in those days, "the blood of kings flowed in the Bruce." "We are from the line of Scottish kings," they said themselves. Even if the settlers (actually refugees) to Russia did not have any high-profile titles or rich estates, sort of

246

still the most important. Russian Bruces may or may not have made a career in their new homeland, but the blood of kings flowed in them.

The Bruces are an intellectual race (by the way, relatives of the Byrons). Based on the material of ancient royal and noble families, it is generally very easy to look for various kinds of patterns - after all, the history of such families is not poorly studied. If the Habsburgs, for nothing that the emperors, or the English Plantagenets became famous mainly for crazy duels, mistresses and drunkards, then such ruling families as the Polish-Russian Jagiellons, the Swedish Vasa or the English Tudors, produced many intellectuals - scientists, poets, philosophers. The same among noble families: the most famous representative of the Saltykov family is undoubtedly Daria Saltykova, the famous Saltychikha. You can't say the same about the boyar family of the Buynosovs: all the Buynosovs were gray as mice, and just as inconspicuous. But the Volkonskys or Golitsyns in almost every generation are represented by bright personalities, unusual destinies and who left a long mark.

So, the Bruces are intellectuals. Their example clearly shows how SOMETHING is smoldering in family history for generations, centuries... It is as if a spark of intelligence and talent runs along a Fickford cord, exploding in some generations either as an intellectual king, or as a poet, or as a major artist.

an Antarctic investigator, then an archaeologist. Jacob Bruce is one of those in whom the family SOMETHING exploded.

Among the associates of Peter, Jacob Bruce is the rarest exception, and in three respects at once.

1. He is superbly educated. Not that "literate" is not enough. He not only speaks and writes fluently in several European languages, he really knows physics, astronomy, mathematics, geography. Where?! Exclusively from books, from communication with intelligent people. Bruce is self-taught, no one specifically taught him. To study in Europe, the Bryuss have no money, and in Muscovy, not only universities, and there are no gymnasiums.

247

Even during the Azov campaigns, others were offended by Bruce's unsociable behavior - he does not run around girls, does not drink wine, reads books.

But even in the years of the "Great Embassy" Jacob Bruce presented to the professors of the University of Amsterdam the work "Theory of planetary motion" and received the academic title of Master of Science. He spent more than a year in England collecting books and maps (which is typical, he was not allowed into Scotland "just in case").

Jacob Bruce back in 1696 compiled a map of the lands from Moscow to the south, to Asia Minor. Compiled so skillfully that the map was published in Amsterdam.

It was Jacob Bruce who, in 1702, created the School of Navigational and Mathematical Sciences in Moscow and equipped an observatory in the Sukharev Tower of the Kremlin.

It was Jacob Bruce who translated the book of H. Huygens "Cosmoteo grew", published in 1717 and 1724 with his preface. This book and the map by V. Kipriyanov introduced the Russians to the fundamentals of the teachings of Copernicus.

Since 1706, Jacob Bruce was in charge of the Moscow Civil Printing House. He edited the globes of the Earth and the celestial sphere, geographical maps and books. In the Civil Printing House, with the direct participation of Bruce, the Lexicon, Mathematics of the Navigator School, Description of the City of Jerusalem and Mount Athos, Image of the Heavenly and Earthly Globe, Battle of the Prut, and much, much more were published. He considered the translation and publication of books to be the most important of his activities.

Yakov Bruce collected a huge library of several thousand volumes and a collection of antiquities - Russian and European. Unlike the Kunstkamera, a collection of all possible deformities and deviations from the rule, its collection of minerals, old coins is well systematized.

wana and really gives an idea of several branches of science. He bequeathed the library and collection to the Academy of Sciences.

Between 1709 and 1715, Bruce issued a calendar containing calculations of church holidays, predictions of eclipses, and the movement of the constellations for a century ahead.

248

The "Bryusov calendar" was used as early as the beginning of the middle of the 19th century.

Against the background of the illiterate Menshikov, the illiterate, uncultured Tolstoy and Shafirov, against the background of Apraksin, who held the rank of admiral but knew neither mathematics, nor astronomy, nor navigation, Yakov Bruce was a complete black sheep.

2. Yakov Bruce is also a rare exception as a man who was an officer in the army organized by Tsar Fyodor Alekseevich and who continued his career under Peter. He even participated in Vasily Golitsyn's campaigns in the Crimea, but he nevertheless made a career under Peter!

In fact, there is a completely ironclad rule - not one of the officers of the army of Fyodor Alekseevich, the magnificent army that stopped the Turks near Chigirin in 1678 ... Not one of them became a general under Peter. Peter hated everything connected with this army, with Vasily Golitsyn, with the military history of Muscovy before him, before Peter. Probably, an inferiority complex also had an effect - unlike Peter, Vasily Golitsyn fought very professionally, he knew how to take care of his people. Yes, and Peter did not like smart, qualified people. What is at least worth his decree of September 9, 1707: "A subordinate in front of a superior must look dashing and foolish, so as not to embarrass his superiors with his understanding." And his senior officers and generals were not smart girls raised by Fedor Alekseevich and V.V. Golitsyn, and drunkards from All the most and most jesting cathedral.

Jacob Bruce is an exception here too! Perhaps the relative youth of Yakov Bruce, almost the same age as the tsar (Bruce was born in 1670, Peter in 1672) had an effect? After all, Bruce did not take part in the Chigirinsky campaigns, moreover, he did not participate in any way in the reforms of the army and civil administration, he was not personally acquainted with Vasily Golitsyn. After all, in 1689, the year of the coup d'état and the seizure of power by the Naryshkin clan, Bruce was only 19 years old.

In any case, Yakov Bruce is already participating in the Azov campaigns of Peter in 1695 and 1696 - some students

249

Others see this as a way of rehabilitation for the Crimean campaigns. And then we meet him as part of the "Great Embassy" of 1697-1698, and already as a confidant of Peter.

During the Northern War, Bruce organizes artillery; he commanded artillery in the battle of Poltava. It was he who brought down the fire of 72 Russian guns on the Swedes, who could only snarl from 4 field guns.

We also see Jacob Bruce in the Prut campaign of 1711. In general, he constantly flashed in the very closest circle of Peter and made an absolutely brilliant career under him.

Since 1717, he was a member of the Governing Senate and the head of the Berg and Manufacture colleges. In 1721, Yakov Vilimovich Bruce, together with Andrei Ivanovich Osterman, signed the Treaty of Nystadt, thus ending the Northern War in favor of Muscovy ... now the Russian Empire. And for this he received the title of count.

By the way, there are references that the title of count was offered to him back in 1710, for the organization of artillery. And that Yakov Vilimovich refused the title, considering himself unworthy (at least he gave such an explanation). If this is true, the personality of Yakov Vilimovich Bruce becomes even more mysterious.

3. And the third unique feature that sharply separates Bruce from all the other associates of Peter: he had what is called a private life. No, I don't mean that only he lived some kind of emotional or sexual life, that's not the point. But Yakov Vilimovich, in addition to his official duties, his career, and his circles, had a huge field of occupations, affections, and acquaintances, which concerned only him alone, into which he would not let anyone in, and which he never refused.

I dare say that none of Peter's closest associates had anything like this. Their lives belonged entirely to the service and career. In the name of service and career, family, friendship, inclinations and interests were relegated to the second (and third, and tenth) plan. All life, all aspects of it, were reduced

250

code - moving up the steps of the career ladder.

Tyrants, by the way, greatly appreciate such people - those who can say about themselves "I have nothing but servants."

would". Such people, who have nothing else and who cannot adequately exist outside of their career, outside of what they have achieved in the service, seem to them the most reliable. Where should they go?! They are too dependent to be false, unreliable. Indeed, what would the same Menshikov do if Peter had driven him out of service?! Even if you do not take away all the stolen goods, leave Menshikov one of the richest people in Europe, what would he, poor fellow, do? Most likely, he would simply go crazy from boredom, from the emptiness of his life.

And if we also take away the stolen goods, the most gloomy, gloomy poverty shined on the "most illustrious prince" - after all, he would not be able to earn a living by honest labor even for a tradesman. Is it to trade pi horns ...

But Jacob Bruce always had something to do, in addition to service and career! First, he had a family. Yakov Vilimovich did not share his wife, Margarita von Manteuffel, he worked with his daughters, loved to spend time with his family. Painting by V.I. Surikov's "Menshikov in Berezov" is extremely false - simply because the family idyll is completely not in the spirit of Menshikov. "Danilych" was organically unable to lead the life of an exemplary family man: neither to be faithful to his wife, nor to communicate with his own children.

And Jacob Bruce was quite capable and wanted it! And exiled to his village, and spending evenings free from service at home, he led a life filled with meaning.

And then, he had science. It took at least a short amount of time to appear, and right there he found himself with a book in his hands, with a compass near the globe or with a goniometer near a huge telescope. He corresponded with many scientists in Europe, wrote dozens of articles, translated and prepared books for publication. He always had something to do, and, very likely, it was the service that weighed him down - the need to always go somewhere

251

to race, to do something, to apply the knowledge of mathematics to the calculation of the accuracy of gunfire and to the construction of BRIDGES.

In addition, Jacob Bruce could well serve not only Tsar Peter. All the other "companions" of Peter had no choice; except that some petty Muslim king would have taken them into service if Peter had refused them. But Vilimych had other options. Qualified, intelligent, he could get a place at many European universities. For this, he had both the command of languages, and the necessary knowledge, and a name. An officer like him could be taken into the European armies.

There was a short period of disgrace in his life: after the defeat of the Russian army near Narva, Yakov Bruce fell into the number of "switchmen" who turned out to be "guilty" of the defeat. He spent a year, exiled to his estate ... And during this year he received a direct offer - to obtain an officer's patent in Holland. And through mutual acquaintances in the Nemetskaya Sloboda, the trustees of the University of Amsterdam, where he received his degree, made inquiries - would Jacob Bruce agree to give a course of lectures on astronomy? So if Peter "kicked" him, Yakov Vilimovich could also choose between a military career and an academic one.

That is, it turns out that if all of Peter's associates have a completely insignificant zone in which they can make free decisions and do what they want, then Bruce's zone is just very large.

A natural question arises: why did Peter suffer him? Why did he even promote Jacob Bruce, support him, allow a lot?

There can be at least four different, but not contradictory, answers to this question.

1. Jacob Bruce was for Peter one of the "amusing", that is, a person associated with him from early youth. Whatever he did, he remained "his own" for Peter. Moreover, Yakov Vilimovich never allowed himself a single word of criticism against Peter. After the death of the army during | Azov campaign and Menshikov, and Buturlin, and Le

252

fort, and Gordon criticized Peter's actions. But not Bruce! Peter had every reason to consider Bruce a very devoted person.

2. Jacob Bruce diligently participated in the "fun wars" and in the meetings of the All-Drunken Council. He, a fairly ordinary participant in the Azov campaigns, was introduced to Peter by the legendary Franz Lefort. That is, when Yakov Bruce needed to make a career, he, a descendant of kings, did not disdain the company of either the "Most Drunk Patriarch", the insignificant Nikita Zotov, or the alcoholic and bugger, the personal friend of the devils and the devil whose son Lefort.

If this conjecture is correct, then we have to admit that the career of Jacob Bruce is the work of Jacob Bruce himself, who was not shy about means.

But his very "approach" to Franz Lefort is an indicator of another possible reason why he was the person of grata to Peter.



3. The Lutheran Jacob Bruce, whose powerful relatives remained in Scotland, Master of Science at the University of Amsterdam, was for Peter the representative of the very Europe he deified. He was forgiven much that was not forgiven to "his own", native Russians.

It was for this reason that, as a "serving foreigner", well known in the German Quarter and who knew many in it, he easily got into Lefort's company. It may very well be that Lefort was asked about him by some general familiar.

4. Like many tyrants before and after, Peter was smart enough not to kill the goose that lays golden eggs. So, much later, Vladimir Ivanovich Vernadsky, until his death in 1945, would head the Radium Committee, a whole bunch of commissions, prepare his own school, be a member of the Central Committee - and besides, V.I. Vernadsky was one of the founders of the Cadets Party! Moreover, his daughter lived in Prague, and his son taught at Princeton University! Moreover, Vernadsky did not even really hide his ... let's say, his rather complicated attitude towards the Soviet regime. But he is too useful, he will be too important

253

for many, many trends in Soviet politics! We'll have to "endure" him, "forgive" him what many paid for not only with their careers, but also with their lives, and dozens of years in the camps.

Maybe Jacob Bruce is Vernadsky of the 17th century? The one whom Peter had to endure, because without him it would be worse?

These are, of course, questions without a single answer.

Like the question - what did Yakov Vilimovich himself think about his life and his fate? What was the main thing for him? The fact is that Yakov Vilimovich did not leave any documents, no evidence of his attitude to Peter, and to himself, and to his era. It seems that one of the two qualities that helped Yakov Vilimovich very much is at work here: he was amazingly able to drink without getting drunk, and so on. he had an amazing ability to keep his mouth shut. Thanks to these qualities, he did not make mistakes in the service, but he did not leave any interesting notes either. And a diary too

did not lead

In any case, the more you look closely at his figure, the more you think about him, the more certainty develops: he was a very "closed" person, who did not at all seek to give others too much information about himself.

And second, he was a man who lived in complex spirits.

fundamental dimensions of the most active intellectual life. In particular, and therefore he is less noticeable, less known than many others - than those who diligently climbed to the forefront and took picturesque poses there. Bruce needed something completely different. Forced to earn a living by the work of an officer and a courtier, he always had a different layer in this life, almost hidden from all wasps.

thal.

BRUCE, PETERSBURG AND MOSCOW

For the characterization of Yakov Vilimovich Bruce, it is very important that he did not like Petersburg. At least, we have no information that Petersburg evoked any positive emotions in him at all. Here is Mosk

254

wu Jacob Bruce loved, this is known for sure. He always returned to Moscow with pleasure, and if he could choose where to stay, he usually chose Moscow. All the intellectual activity of Yakov Bruce is connected with Moscow, especially with the Sukharev tower, in which he had his office and astronomical laboratory.

In essence, we have before us a pronounced Muscovite by birth and upbringing, for whom Moscow is a small homeland, in which it is most comfortable for him to be.

Is he Scottish? Yes, ethnically Scottish. But Jacob Bruce was a Scot who never saw Scotland in his life. There was one chance after the "Great Embassy", and then "just in case" they did not let me in. The colors of Scotland, her winds, sea coasts and mountain ranges beyond the Avon were pure theory to him. Approximately the same as for most of my dear readers, and for myself - something from Stevenson, from Walter Scott ...

But how the melted March snow smells, how the cranes fly over the fields and where to pick porcini mushrooms, the so-called Scotsman Jacob Bruce knew far from theoretically. So who is he?!

... Alexander Nebolsin, the grandson of the very officer who fired the legendary cannon shot from the Aurora, a sign to begin the assault on the Winter Palace, spoke very well about this. When the Soviet gang approached him in 1995, they say, tell me, what should we do now?! He shrugged his shoulders and answered with complete certainty:

- Well, why are you clinging to an American Russian

origin? It's time to learn to solve your own problems...

The third generation living in the USA, Nebolsin is none other than "an American of Russian origin."

Probably, Jacob Bruce, a descendant of Scottish kings, a Russian of Scottish origin, could probably answer the Scots in the same way to the question of whether they should rebel against the new dynasty. All his habits, tied

255

features, everyday inclinations are purely Russian. And he even married a Lutheran, but by no means a Scot, but a Baltic German. Even if both of his daughters had survived, the descendants of Jacob Bruce would no longer be full-blooded ethnic Scots.

But all this is an explanation of why Jacob Bruce loved Moscow, but not an explanation of the reasons why he did not love Petersburg. This is all the more strange because the very personality of Yakov Vilimovich surprisingly corresponds to the Petersburg landscape, the peculiarities of Petersburg culture, the way of life of this amazing city.

But the fact of the matter is that Yakov Vilimovich, who died in 1735, "corresponded" not at all to the Petersburg to which he was contemporary .... But to the city that arose not earlier than the end of the 17th century, which we Wu, and we know by that name. At the time of Yakov Bruce, this Petersburg did not exist, and it was incomparably more difficult for him to fit into the life of a "regular" feudal-police city than in the life of feudal-patriarchal Moscow. |

#### BRUCE THE WARROCARD

No less interesting is the reputation of Yakov Vilimovich - moreover, the reputation both during his lifetime and posthumously - the reputation of a warlock and a sorcerer.

About what Bruce's witchcraft books are, one can say quite confidently, because his library was transferred to the archive of the Academy of Sciences - the books are Dutch, German and English. The fact that these books were so easily mistaken for witchcraft writings written in an unknown language proves only the high cultural level and extensive knowledge of those who surrounded Jacob Bruce and saw these books - nothing more.

Why a sorcerer? And where does the endless number of stories about Bruce the Wizard come from?! Here, too, after all, one can assume a completely materialistic explanation of the issue, without involving any mystical

assumptions.

256

Firstly, Jacob Bruce was engaged in incomprehensible and unusual things: he looked at the sky, at the stars, through the "glass eye" (telescope). Read books in "unknown tongues". He set up chemical experiments, frightening the servants half to death with the spectacle of changing color before their eyes, "boiling without fire", amazingly smelling solutions in multi-colored flasks, of the most "magical" kind.

2. The results of his activities were also incomprehensible and unusual. Some of them, and moreover the most important ones - for example, the improvement of the composition of gun copper or the calculation of the movement of planets around the Sun, were simply not known to the general population and even to the wide sections of the service class - and they were not interested in it.

What was known about the fruits of Bruce's activities? That he calculated solar eclipses a hundred years ahead (the legendary "Bryusov Calendar"). That he translated and published many heretical foreign books hostile to "true Orthodoxy." That he gave the king strange advice many times, which for some reason always turned out to be true.

In order to correctly assess this kind of fruits of the learning of Yakov Vilimovich, the Muscovites of that time simply did not have the necessary intellectual and cultural ideas.

3. ...Because Muscovy spiritually continued to live in the Middle Ages, and the image of a sorcerer in a robe embroidered with stars was much closer and more understandable to Muscovites than the type of a scientist of the New Age. It was much easier for them to explain their knowledge by receiving it from some otherworldly beings than to see in it the fruits of their own teaching and their own labor.

4. Jacob Bruce himself seemed to be making considerable efforts to match the "image" of the sorcerer and black scribe. For example, he worked hard at night. In general, many scientists like to work at night - at night everyone (including family members) is already asleep and does not get in the way. Quiet at night. At night, no one will come running, will not call anywhere, will not violate solitude and will not disturb the peace. At night, the human mind does not work at all

257

just like in the daytime - the subconscious mind is disinhibited, and the most daring ideas, the craziest images, the most unexpected comparisons arise, as a rule, after

12am. If you need to do creative work - there is no time better than the night!

Scientists have many reasons to love the night. But try to explain this to an ordinary Muscovite who finds himself not far from the Sukharev Tower long after midnight and sees an unfaithful greenish-blue light in the windows of the "sorcerer's cell", hears the measured tinkling of flasks (like the steps of an unknown creature!), catches the stench of chemicals in his nose... Rumors about Bruce the black scribe spread throughout Moscow, then throughout Russia, and then these rumors took shape in wonderful folklore stories. There are several recurring themes in these stories.

1. Jacob Bruce makes a man out of flowers.

Jacob Bruce makes a maid - for some reason it is specified that "from flowers". The maid is just like a human, only she can't speak. The wife of Jacob Bruce begins to be jealous: "But all the same, not without the fact that you live with her." Well, he finally brings it to the point that he takes a hairpin from the maid's hair - and the girl crumbles into heaps of flowers.

2. Jacob Bruce makes an iron eagle that can fly. In one version of the legend, he even flies on this eagle "who knows where" from Tsar Peter who took up arms against him.

3. Jacob Bruce invents an elixir for reviving and gives the king a vial of this liquid - just in case. After death, the king needs him - there is no one else to give him advice. And then the king opens the tomb of Bruce; Bruce's corpse has not decomposed at all, the king drips elixir and receives the necessary advice from the revived Bruce...

I strongly advise the reader to find a book by E. Baranov, who took the trouble to write down Moscow legends (including those about Yakov Bruce) that were circulating in Moscow back in the 1920s.

1 Baranov E.V. Moscow legends recorded by Evgeny Baranov. M., 1993.

258

And besides folk legends, many stories were told and made up about Bruce - and that he was a Mason of the highest degree of initiation and even the head of all Russian Freemasons. And that he knew how to fly through the air (this is no longer semi-literate peasants, but it seems to be an educated people). There is even a storyteller of the 19th century, where Yakov Bruce, even after his death, sits in a certain building in Moscow, playing solitaire fate, determining how to live, whom to marry and where to go. It is being told, I warn you, in all seriousness!

Not to mention the fact that the "Bryusov Calendar" was written after him, but all sorts of mystical calculations on which day it is better to "create a battle", "start thinking" or "cut your hair" were also attributed to Yakov Bruce ....

Strictly speaking, Jacob Bruce is not the first victim of human stupidity and ignorance. Among such victims innocently glorified by sorcerers, European history knows not only rich merchants, townspeople, university professors, rich peasants, hunters, woodcutters, descendants of kings and kings themselves (among kings, oddly enough, sometimes quite smart ones come across) but there is even one pope.

... It was said about Innocent [that he sold his soul to the devil and at night he conjures in the old tower (recognize the flavor? - A. B.). For witchcraft, the "black dad" reads demonic books written in a language unknown to anyone, and the windows of this tower are lit at night with blue-green-blue flames, and the tower trembles, stones knock from each other when unknown creatures appear there.

Some even saw with their own eyes how papa with a bluish-green face danced and sang in the morning, returning from this tower, and allegedly sometimes he lay in the morning in a strange numb state, and it was impossible to wake him up.

It was also said that when the late pope was being buried, when the coffin stood in St. Peter's Basilica, suddenly a person appeared at the head of the coffin, wrapped in a black cloak with his head. Candles suddenly began to glow blue and green

259

cold and stench crawled from this figure. Whether you wanted to raise your hand to make the sign of the cross, not a single hand was raised. They wanted to ask the stranger who he was and where he came from - no one could open his mouth.

And then the stranger disappeared, but where he stood, there were two traces melted in the stone, resembling hooves in shape.

As for the footprints, they have survived to this day, anyone can see hoof marks. This part of the story just has to be believed. And as for books... The fact is that all the books of Pope Innocent II are stored in the Vatican Library and are completely accessible. One of them is written in Hebrew, four are in Arabic, and all the rest, up to ten, are in Greek. What a fantastic ignoramus one must be to talk about "unknown languages" - I don't even want to discuss it.

Yes, and the strange behavior of the pope can also have an unrespectable, but very materialistic explanation: one of the devices that the learned dad created, judging by the drawings, is very reminiscent of a moonshine still. No, I do not assert anything, I do not insist on anything, and I do not accuse the pope of anything. I'm only saying that the device looks like a moonshine, and nothing more - and it looks like it from my biased and probably vicious point of view.

However, let's get back to Bruce, a great scientist, sorcerer.

#### BRUCE AND THE SEARCH FOR THE EXIT

Undoubtedly, Yakov Bruce is exactly the type of person who was sorely lacking in the Russian Empire after the death of Peter. An independent, intelligent and powerful person, he would be able, if not immediately to "lead" the country out of the impasse, then at least he could greatly contribute to this. Moreover, it is quite obvious - just for him the words about duty, honor, responsibility were not at all empty concussions of the air.

260

Was he not in demand? But in the Russian Empire, after the death of Peter, there was no supreme arbiter who could "claim" someone and somewhere. Anarchy reigned, in which everyone "claimed" himself as he saw fit. Why, then, did he not try to push the temporary workers out of power, to intrigue, to seek the return of the Russian Empire to the natural path of development?

If it is true that he is a Mason, then why did he not look for another way out suitable for his organization?! Life experience says that lovers of building "regular states" are never disappointed by the negative experience they have received. Instead of a "paradise", a paradise on earth, "for some reason" it turned out to be a concentration camp, a madhouse, an ecological garbage dump? It's all the fault of incompetent builders. And now we have experience! Or another variant: these were the wrong guinea pigs, not ideological enough; now we take the meme as it should. In a word, get to work, comrades—it is necessary to build a "correct" and perfect "regular state," another heaven on earth—now taking into account mistakes.

But Jacob Bruce does not do this either, and his Freemasonry becomes even more doubtful from this. Why didn't he try to build a "correct regular state"?! Why, after the death of Peter Yakov, Bruce did not become a de-

say absolutely nothing? Nothing at all. Immediately, abruptly, he resolutely withdrew from everything, began to visit less even his beloved Berg Collegium, and almost stopped communicating with all the other "chicks of Petrov's nest." All of them were just in the most active way "hanging out", trying to make a career, score points and at the same time being afraid to lose sight of each other. And Yakov Vilimovich, on the contrary, tried his best to retire and sit

as quiet as possible.

Of course, this state of affairs could not continue for long.

There are two legends connected with the resignation of Yakov Vilimovich. The first legend is that "the chicks of Petrov's nest" began to grumble: where, they say, is Yakov Bruce ?!

261

Why does he not go anywhere, does not communicate with others, has moved away from active life? Perhaps the fetid "chicks" were driven by fear of Bruce. After all, he is smart, which means that he will do large-scale dirty tricks and, in general, will become the most

main...

After making sure that Bruce was not dangerous to them, the rest of the "chicks" began to eat him: they say, we understand why he does not go anywhere - he has grown old, his strength is not the same. Probably, it is already difficult for him to lead the collegium, and isn't it time for him to resign?

Allegedly, it was these conversations that became the impetus for the resignation of Jacob Bruce.

The second legend is even more piquant. According to this legend, Menshikov extorted a bribe from Bruce - he promised that if he "bows" to him, then he will "say a word" for Bruce, and will not allow him to be dismissed. And when Bruce did not give a bribe, he made a report to Catherine - they say, it's time to remove the aged, flabby "Vilimych" from business.

However, these are legends. It is authentically known that Ekaterina never demanded resignation from Bruce, and when Yakov Bruce handed the resignation letter to the queen, she cried:

"It's you, Vilimych, are you leaving me?! Who will I stay with?"

Whether the reason for these tears was purely alcoholic or the queen was really scared to be left without people like Bruce, it's hard to say. It is also a fact that Bruce was not moved to pity by her tears, he insisted on his resignation. In 1726, Catherine dismissed Bruce with the rank of field marshal, and he settled in his "Glinka estate" near Moscow. Now it is the Shchelkovsky district of the Moscow region.



Of course, the reason for the resignation was anything but old age. It was not old age that was the reason why Jacob Bruce did not become active after the death of Peter, but, on the contrary, went into the shadows. Jacob Bruce was born in 1670, which means that in 1726 he was 56 years old. Not a young man, but not a ruin either. And for the last 9 years of his life, already in the countryside, he also did not live at all like a relaxed old man: he constantly traveled to Moscow, carried on active correspondence, made some experiments, replenished his collection of minerals.

262

By the way, the most active intriguer Count Tolstoy was 25 years older - he was born in 1645, and old age did not at all prevent him from intriguing as much as he could (to what extent he, poor fellow, was intrigued - this is the second question).

What is very curious is that Yakov Bruce survived the rest of the "chicks of Petrov's nest" - they all ended quickly and ingloriously, except for Alexei Petrovich Bestuzhev-Ryumin, but this is a man of a completely different generation, born in 1693. If A.P. Bestuzhev-Ryumin did not reach the position of a chancellor, no one would call him "the chick of Petrov's nest" - after all, it is obvious that he was never in close relations with Peter, and among the people who determined policy under Peter, in no way did not enter.

If we take these "members", then by 1735, when Yakov Bruce died peacefully in his village, having partake of the Holy Mysteries, only two of this ultra-narrow circle remained alive besides him: Pavel Yaguzhinsky, who had a year to live, and the cunning Westphalian German Andrey Osterman - this one would live right up to 1747 and die in exile in Berezovo.

It turns out an amazing thing - it turns out that Jacob Bruce behaved extremely reasonably - just the way it was necessary for self-preservation.

Incidentally, not a single study, either pre-revolutionary or Soviet, attempts to explain why all of a sudden such a quick and easy resignation?! For some reason, I did not find any books dedicated to him personally, but he is mentioned in a large number of studies.

Indeed, why did he so easily retire from active political life after the death of Peter?

I see three possible reasons, and let the reader judge for himself which one is more likely.

1. I was afraid of the struggle with Menshikov, the intrigue of all against all, leading to the destruction of each other.

1 Nikiforov L.A. Foreign policy of Russia in the last years of the Northern War. Nystadt world. M., 1959.

263

If so, he foresaw further than others, and his act is truly self-preservation in its purest form.

2. Intelligence, intelligence, culture interfered. People of his level do not engage in dirty intrigues... at least they do not want to engage in them if there is an opportunity to step aside... Jacob Bruce had such an opportunity.

3. Having received everything he wanted, Jacob Bruce no longer strove for money-grubbing. Until the death of Peter, he could not retire, but here he was able and with a clear conscience indulged in his Glinka studies.

In any case, this was just the person who was needed to find a way out of the impasse. And just like that, he turned out to be completely unclaimed!

## HISTORICAL FATE

In general, it must be said that the company of the "chicks of Petrov's nest" crept up not only that it was fetid and bad, but also extremely unviable: both short-lived and left no offspring. As soon as Peter died, the members of this circle quarreled, betrayed each other and began to die one by one.

And in descendants these people are barren. If the reader thinks that I am a spiteful critic and slander fine people, let him name any of the Menshikovs, Yaguzhinskys, Golovins, Buturlins. Name at least one famous statesman, famous for his deeds, scientist, writer, artist, military man, traveler - in a word, according to the merits of a famous person descended from one of these people. From those who owe their very existence to Peter.

Flashed Menshikov - Minister of the Navy under Nikolai | ... But why is he famous? By the fact that Nikolai wanted to have "his" Menshikov at court at any cost? So that he had everything, like Peter? Or by the fact that the minister by all means prevented the establishment of steamships in the Russian Empire? Why is this Nikolay minister famous? And he would become not only a minister,

264

but at least a head clerk, he does not wear a historical

last name?

Another Menshikov flashed by - the leading publicist of the Novoye Vremya newspaper in 1901-1917 - a terrifying chauvinist and obscurantist, a maniacal anti-Semite, viciously calling (what a twist of fate!) To pre-Petrine Rus', branding "Peter's reforms" as a Jewish Masonic instigation. If he had not been shot by the Bolsheviks at the beginning of 1918, he would hardly be remembered today. Now - no, but a victim.

That's all... That's all the "great" people of the Menshikov family for two hundred years of our imperial history (the Golovins and Yaguzhinskys don't even have that).

At the same time, the "conservative boyars" — the Dolgoruky, the Golitsyn, the Tolstoy — literally in every generation produced bright, enthusiastic, meaningful people, each of whom has reason to remember today.

V.V. It is not for nothing that Mavrodin includes the Petrine nominee Yakov Bruce in the group of representatives of the "old families". The reason here is not in the royal blood, and not only in the ideological and cultural closeness. The historical fate of both the Scottish and Russian Brusses is incomparably closer to the fate of the Golitsyns and Tolstoys than the Menshikovs.

The children of Jacob Bruce by Marguerite von Manteuffel died in their early teens. The grave of Jacob Bruce in the Nemetskaya Sloboda, in the Lutheran Church of St. Michael, is lost. Bruce shared the fate of the Russian nobility, exterminated with maniacal persistence by the Bolsheviks - even in the graves.

The later Russian Bruces are descended from Yakov's younger brother, Robert Vilimovich Bruce. Robert Bruce, who became Roman Vilimovich in the Russian service, had a son Alexander, Yakov's natural nephew. The son of Alexander was named Jacob, in honor of his great-uncle. Yakov Alexandrovich died in 1791, and the lineage of the Russian Bryuses in the male line was cut short. However, these Bruces were not counts either.

265

In the middle of the 20th century, one of the families that descended from those famous Bryusovs through the female line returned their family name, but in a "Russified" form - Bryusovy. In the twentieth century, this family broke out with two gifted people - an archaeologist and writer and poet, Valery Bryusov '.

Both famous brothers died childless, but they had three sisters and all had children... The blood of Scottish kings flows in people from several Russian families.

intelligentsia.

And the Scottish Bruces are numerous, incredibly active. Already in the 20th century, the famous Antarctic explorer William Bruce emerged from them, who studied the Wedell Sea and its shores, and in 1913 proposed a transantarctic route from the Wedell Sea to the Ross Sea. Such a bold route that V. Fuchs passed them only in 1857-1858.

Also known is the nationalist poet Robert Bruce, who in his poems settles accounts with the British for the victory at Marston Moor and other grievances of three hundred years ago. Knowledgeable people say, however, that he is a good poet, even though he is obsessed with revenge.

Well, and several dozen Bruces - doctors, teachers in colleges and universities, entrepreneurs, engineers. An intelligent Scottish family, known for eight centuries.

1 Bryusov V.A. Collected works in seven volumes. M., 1973-1975.

Part III

#### CONSEQUENCES OF THE ANTICHRIST'S RULE

The beginning leaves an imprint on every phenomenon. Aristotle

#### Chapter 1 THE SON OF THE ANTICHRIST

And love the poor Son will  
be pale.

B.Sh. Okudzhava

Of course, any historical act immediately acquires legends. The more the event influenced contemporaries, the more it changed history, the more myths, of course. During the 36 years of Peter's reign, the population of Russia decreased by 20%, and after surviving another Trouble, the country began to live in completely different dimensions, according to completely different rules. The events of the Petrine era made a colossal impression both on contemporaries and on their close descendants. For several generations, Russia was pounding and shaking like a person who had survived a severe illness. Natural-

but, about Peter and the figures of his era, there is simply a fantastic number of the most diverse stories. And about the fact that Alexander Menshikov sold pies as a child. And that Peter from infancy showed extraordinary abilities. And that only the Old Believers called him the Antichrist, and the whole country, except for a bunch of fools and maniacal conservatives, was downright hungry for his reforms.

But besides these relatively innocent legends, there are several very dangerous myths. Dangerous because each of them is a smoke screen over the blood and dirt of the era. Leave these myths, do not touch - and all official

269

the myth of the Petersburg era becomes something quite real. Take these myths out, subject them to critical analysis - and from the whole myth of the Great Reformer there is no stone left unturned, and the pink glow turns into dirty foam. These are the main, central myths of the Petrine era; myths about Tsarevich Alexei, about Catherine | and about the "companions of Peter".

#### THE FATE OF THE SON OF THE ANTICHRIST

The execution by a father of his own son cannot but attract the attention of society. This is not at all the subject to which people can remain indifferent. Peter executed one of his wife's lovers, Willim Mons. Some will sympathize with Mons, others will sympathize with Peter, others will grin maliciously, others will nod approvingly: but don't mess with other people's wives! But, in all the variety of assessments and opinions, it is unlikely that at least someone will compare this execution and the sentence to Tsarevich Alexei. People are quite ready to admit that both Willim Mons and Peter himself were quite decent, normal people. Willim played a risky game, lost, paid according to the laws of the era. There may well be no villains and monsters on both sides - only gamblers who can put their own lives on the line.

If the father executes the son, then there cannot be two people colliding in such a game. There is no cruel and rude, but morally neutral game of life here. Here either the son is a monster from which the father escaped; or vice versa - there is a monster father, and the victim - his own child. In order for society to accept this execution as inevitable and to maintain respect for the father, not to recoil from him in horror, the son must be dangerous, and, if possible, disgusting. Such that people would already recoil from their son, considering his destruction a necessity.

This is exactly how the most prominent Russians interpreted Alexei.

historians - from Peter's contemporaries to S.F. Platonov and V.O. Klyuchevsky.

270

V.N. Tatishchev simply calls Alexei a "traitor" without bothering to prove it: he probably doesn't need it. He calls it as a matter of course.

S.F. Platonov ascribes to Alexei Petrovich "pre-reform tastes and views, pre-reform theology, striving for outward piety, contemplative inactivity and sensual pleasures" and sums up: "a flabby nature who did not love her father".

CM. Solov'yov is still more streamlined: "Tsarevich Alexei Petrovich was by nature precisely the representative of these educated Russian people, who did not like the activities of Peter the same as the schismatics ... Tsarevich Alexei Petrovich was smart and inquisitive, as he was smart and his grandfather, Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich, or his uncle, Fyodor Alekseevich, is inquisitive; but, like them, he was slow to move, incapable of strenuous activity, of tireless movement, which distinguished his father (the price of this "tireless movement" and "intense activity" is a symptom of neurosis. - A. B.); he was physically lazy and therefore a homebody, who liked to learn curious things from a book, from a conversation only; that's why he liked the Russians of the second half of the 17th century so much, and that's why they liked him so much. ... Tsarevich Alexei, who looked like a grandfather and uncle, was an educated, progressive Russian man of the 17th century, was a representative of the old trend; Peter was an advanced Russian man of the 17th century, a representative of a different direction: the father was ahead of the son! The son, by nature, thirsted for peace and hated everything that required movement ... the father ... for the sake of the present and future, demanded from his son attention to those means that could provide Russia with the power it had acquired, and for this practical activity was needed, a constant movement, necessary according to the significance of the Russian tsar, according to the form of Russian government. As a result of these demands, on the one hand, and the natural, irresistible disgust for you

1 Platonov S.F. Lectures on Russian history. M., 1993. S. 538. 271

fulfilling them, on the other hand, and from the very beginning a sad relationship arose between father and son, a relationship between a tormentor and a victim, for nowhere is there greater torment than the demand to change one's nature, and this is exactly what Peter demanded from his son.

In general, Alexey is also a good person, it's all about

nature of both, what can you do, but Peter, of course, is much more "advanced" than his son ... This is still a very soft assessment, unusually tolerant of Alexei, because in the St. Petersburg period of our history, Peter's rigorous justification and extremely negative opinion about Alexei became the official point of view.

"Peter did not have the opportunity, in the midst of constant anxieties and worries, to take up the education of his son, Alexei Petrovich. The people who surrounded the prince in his youth were hostile to Peter and managed to convey to the prince their dislike for the Great Transformer and his activities. The prince constantly showed passive opposition to his father, evaded, if possible, participation in state affairs, and, finally, he decided to even enter into an open struggle with his father: he fled abroad, to the court of the German emperor, Charles \ 1, and surrendered under his protection. Peter managed to return his son to Russia and dealt with him extremely harshly: he brought him to court from the highest dignitaries of the state, by which the prince was sentenced to death; but he died before the execution of the sentence from those unrest and moral torments that he suffered during the search (June 26, 1718) "2.

This is a courtly position in which all sharp corners are circumvented in the most accurate way and all contradictions are softened; in which everything has not been agreed that would make it possible to cast doubt on this position ... This position formed the basis of everything that was said about the conflict between Peter and Alexei both in St. Petersburg and in Soviet times.

1 Soloviev S.M. History of Russia since ancient times. Book (H. M., 1963. S. 109.

2 Eger O. World history in 4 volumes. T. 3. St. Petersburg, 1894. S. 503. 272

Moreover, the absolute majority of educated people shared this position.

IN. Klyuchevsky wrote quite seriously that Peter, in the name of his "great cause", "sacrificed both his son and the natural order of succession to the throne."

Or take the classic painting by Nikolai Nikolaevich Ge "Peter | interrogates Tsarevich Alexei Petrovich in Peterhof. This picture corresponded so well with the basic social attitude toward Alexei and Peter that it was cited in all history textbooks and was invariably used in one or two lessons devoted to the time of Peter the Great.

The clash of two people in Ge is frankly given as a clash of two historical forces ... The point here is clearly not only family. How righteous, how sure

but the king is right in the picture! And how secretive, cowardly, vilely cowardly the prince is! To look at him - and it is immediately clear that his deed is wrong and dishonest, that he did some utter disgusting thing and fell for it, that, due to cowardice and meanness of character, he does not dare to confess to them, and that the angry, but sympathetic Peter will have to fiddle around for a long time, squeezing out of him "evidence" about the big and small dirty tricks he committed. A talented artist, Ge perfectly conveys to the viewer just such an understanding of the situation.

In Soviet times, this version, which came from the 17th century, was repeated, accompanied by instructive analogies with Stalin's refusal to exchange his son for Paulus. Here, they say, as Peter did, sacrificed his son in the name of a great cause, so did the great patriot Comrade Stalin.

But it is worth taking a closer look at the circumstances of the case, and the same thing happens that happened in their time with Pushkin and Tolstoy: a reassessment of values is inevitable.

Not only because Peter did not love either his first wife, Evdokia Lopukhina, or his son from her, and he never raised Alexei. He practically never caressed the children from his second marriage, did not talk to them, never taught them anything. This concerned not only legitimate children from

273

permanent wives, but also so-called bastards. The total number of known bastards of Peter | reaches at least 90 or 100 people. The number of unknown children of Peter may very well be even greater.

For example, a professor at St. Petersburg University, Okun, at his lectures, somehow threw out the phrase that "of course, we will never take everyone into account, but science can vouch for a few hundred." It was about the fact that we only have information about Peter's bastards from noblewomen and, in general, from women from the top of society, from an environment that knew how to write and read. And the fact that Peter did not disdain both peasant women and soldier prostitutes is a lot of evidence. This is evidenced at least by the story of Marta Skavronskaya, who became empress, if

then it went.

All his children, a huge number of fatherless, Peter never recognized, never helped any of them. Repeatedly, Peter spoke in the spirit that if, they say, the heir is capable of at least something, he will break through, "rise", and he does not need help. Some of them "made their way", for example Rumyantsev-Zadunaisky. The majority, of course, did not "rise from nothingness" - especially the children of women from the "common people".



Quite a funny thought: in modern Russia, and not only in Russia, there certainly live people descended from the Romanovs in a direct male line, but who do not have the slightest idea about it! It would be interesting and instructive, firstly, to look at the reaction of people who would suddenly find out: I have royal blood! Secondly, it would be interesting to take into account the rights of ALL of these potential contenders for the throne.

So, Peter [never interacted with his children - married or illegitimate - and, apparently, did not like any of them. He seemed to show some feelings for the quickly deceased sons from Catherine, Peter and Pavel - in any case, he took them in his arms as babies, kissed them sonorously on the ass, ordered the courtiers to shout "Vivat" to their heirs. But what do we have here?

274

business: with holy paternal feelings or with political action? With a request that the guards and courtiers, from the moment these children were born, would know them as heirs to the throne? God knows...

In any case, with the baby Alexei, with his son at the age of 5, 6 or 10 years, Peter never communicated, and, apparently, Tsarevich Alexei did not interest him at all for many years. After sending Evdokia Lopukhina to Suzdal, to the monastery, Alexei was separated from his mother, and he began to live with his aunt, Princess Natalia Alekseevna. He was then 8 years old.

Only at the age of 15, Tsarevich Alexei received a "command" (like this! Command! - A.B.) to appear at the court. From that time on, Peter did not particularly single out him, but demanded that he share his interests and serve not just diligently, but with zeal. You don't have to be either a king or an emperor to understand that Peter demanded the psychologically impossible. Before the "call" to the court, where another wife of his father had long reigned, Alexei saw his father only a few times. They didn't correspond. Father never spoke to Alexei and was not interested in what he thinks about, what he reads and what he does. To demand from this completely abandoned guy that he love his father and be devoted to him, all the more devoted to the idea of "Petrine's transformations", was simply blatant nonsense.

Apparently, Alexei really did not like his father and was afraid, and even had a strong complex about this. Psychologically, it's not so easy not to love your own father. But nothing shows him as a poorly cultured, physically frail, frail and cowardly person, as Alexei was portrayed and the official historiography of the St. Petersburg period, and subsequently -

Soviet.

He was taught literacy by an educated man, a good ri-

Tor Nikifor Vyazemsky. In 1703-1705, Alexei was brought up by Heinrich Huissen, doctor of law. According to the plan drawn up by him (and approved by Peter), Alexei studied French and German, geography and cartography, arithmetic, geometry, practiced horse riding,

2175

fencing and dancing. He shot well, danced well, rode confidently. He was incomparably better prepared for his position in society than his father.

Alexei loved to study, and the humanities were best for him. Alexei loved music, church singing, books, and church services. A devout man, he knew the Bible well and often reread it. He knew German well and corresponded in German with his tutor, Heinrich Huissen. He could also speak French, but not so well.

By the way, the Tsarevich carried out the orders of Peter not small ones, and did not do them badly at all. In 1708-1709, he collected grain and troops in Smolensk, traveled to Borisov and Minsk, watched the strengthening of the Moscow fortification, sent Swedish "polonyaniki" to St. Petersburg. In 1709, he brought new regiments to his father in Sumy. It is hard to believe that all this is the deeds of a "unfit" and "frail" person.

bodily."

The influence of Peter's enemies? No, there was something, no doubt. Alexei's confessor, the most educated theologian Yakov Ignatiev, was undoubtedly an enemy of Peter I. Whether he was an enemy of transformations is not so clear; We do not have any definite information about this.

The following story has been preserved: once Peter beat Alexei, already an adult guy, about 17 years old, and he admitted in confession that he sometimes wishes his father to die.

- God will forgive you! We all wish him death for the fact that there are many burdens among the people!

This is how the clever confessor answered, helping to lift the burden from his soul and uniting Alexei's youthful feelings with the misfortune of the whole people. True, this story also allows for different interpretations - what did Yakov Ignatiev want? In any case, there is no denial of the "Peter's reforms" either. It is only about the fact that "there is a LOT of hardship", and that's it.

Everyone agrees on the "bad influence" on Alexei - from V.N. Tatishchev to modern, generally objective publications: "The boy was provided

276

himself and found himself surrounded by people who were dissatisfied with the tsar and the reformist policy pursued by him. But it is not very easy to name those specific people who surrounded Alexei and, moreover, were terrible enemies of Peter [and his policy. And really, who is this? The first teachers, say, Nikifor Vyazemsky? Herman Huys sen?

mother's environment? Of course, her exile to the monastery did not become a happy event in the life of Alexei. But if Peter wanted the tonsure of his mother not to become a psychological trauma for the guy, would not become a reason for estrangement, who prevented him from talking with his son? And best of all, constantly communicate with him, so that Alexei would at least try to understand his father? Peter did not do this, either due to terrible employment, or out of indifference. He only "willed to be angry" when Tsarevich Alexei, without asking his permission, went on dates with his mother: for example, in 1707. But pray tell, why shouldn't he meet his own mother?! What the wildest tyranny!

Just after the meeting of Alexei with his mother, Peter beat his son to bruises and scars; it was then that Alexei confessed in confession that he sometimes wished his father to die. But the itut is a purely family aspect of the matter, but the fact that the circle of the mother never influenced Alexei, was not significant for him in any way - this is a fact.

Aleksey maintained good relations with the Vyazemskys, from whose family his tutor came; with his relatives the Naryshkins, Abram Lopukhin - also with his maternal relative. Yes, Alexey, apparently, treated them all well, willingly met with them. So what?! There is no evidence that he appreciated the lessons of these people or that they had any serious influence on him.

Hostile to Peter the clergy? It is already "warmer", but even here, except for Yakov Ignatiev and Leonty Menshikov, it is impossible to find anyone in his circle of clergy.

1 Mavrodin V.V. The birth of a new Russia. L., 1988. S. 258. 277

Moreover, Alexei did not communicate with wanderers, holy fools, passable kaliks; these connections were willingly attributed to him, but completely false. Alexei never kicked the hangers-on and the nuns with his boots, never cursed them or hit them on the head with a stick, as his father, the Great Reformer, sometimes did. But they did not have any spiritual influence on him, this is completely

exactly.

And these two priests? They were educated

people, with them, you know, he talked. He loved smart people, the prince had such a weakness.

Reactionary boyars? Enemies of Peter from the old Moscow boyars?

There were at least two such "reactionary boyars" in his entourage, this is a fact. But to suggest that some kind of "hostility to the reforms" emanated from them is even more absurd than to attribute this to Nikifor Vyazemsky. Indeed, representatives of ancient families maintained a good relationship with Tsarevich Alexei ... For example, Yakov Fedorovich Dolgoruky, one of Peter's closest associates [ . Yakov Fedorovich believed that Alexei "would become a merciful and reasonable monarch", showed him respect and tried to shape the mind of the future monarch.

Another "reactionary boyar" is one of the most educated people in Russia, Dmitri Mikhailovich Golitsyn. Dmitry Mikhailovich corresponded with the prince, brought him books, and had long conversations with him. The Golitsyn family, which gave Peter the terrible enemy and rival, Vasily Golitsyn, was unloved, we suspect in many sins. The contents of Dmitry Mikhailovich's conversations with Alexei immediately became known to the tsar. So, "SLIPPER" topics were not discussed at all. It was about music, books, philosophical theories, occasionally - about European

politics.

To some extent, these people, the highest nobility of Russia, maintained good relations with the future tsar simply out of social duty. But there is something about them that goes beyond the bounds of vassal loyalty. They clearly favored Alexei ... But they would

278

whether in the then Russia the most educated people. And the most experienced! Judging by everything that we know, they, the most influential courtiers and the largest administrators of the world of that, were well versed in people, and if this young man became their "favorite" - oh, this is no accident! It is no coincidence that the children of Peter from Catherine, neither Anna nor Elizabeth, were rated so highly by the highest nobility. And later it turned out that it was not evaluated correctly!

The tsarevich was under the influence of the old nobility... Hm... Is it really the case that the nobility is old?! Maybe there is a simpler reason? For example, the one that it was impossible to talk with Menshikov about music (Menshikov did not know it), or about books (he did not read them), or about philosophy - Menshikov despised philosophy with a steady, servile contempt; lackey's contempt for the "master's inventions." Those who are called Peter's "closest associates" are simply surprisingly uncultured, unintelligent, uneducated, and, as a rule, unintelligent. And dependent! Depend-

we are from Peter, first of all. They will talk with the prince, generally notice his presence, if only he is in favor.

But the aristocracy is precisely cultural, with its representatives there is something to talk about. The aristocracy is incomparably more independent. She has time and opportunity to focus not on who Peter is smiling at the moment, but on a larger factor: the fact that this young man is pleasant and sympathetic to them. And, of course, the fact that a handsome young man will sooner or later become the Russian Tsar.

That Alexei had no friends among the "new courtiers," among the inner circle of the tsar, is a fact. But this fact can be assessed in very different ways, and it is very difficult to blame this circumstance on Tsarevich Alexei. Indeed, why did he have to curry favor with the servants of the throne... HIS, by the way, hereditary and legitimate throne?! As the heir to this throne, he chose educated, worthy and self-confident people in his environment. Those who

279

could help him understand the life around him today and whom he could rely on, becoming king in some future. Verily, tell me who your friend is...

This boyar-aristocratic entourage of Alexei did not at all strive back to boyar Rus'. None of the named and unnamed, none of the Golitsyns and Dolgoruky, Vyazemsky and Miloslavsky, was going to burn the fleet, abandon St. Petersburg, abolish the modern army or prohibit secular printing. For all these completely progressive, in no way reactionary people, it was a question of a smoother, more peaceful transition to the new, without the painful and cruel breaking of established traditions. Without monstrous cruelty towards, in fact, everyone ...

Another classic accusation: "Kind and condescending, he was of a weak character."

Weakness of character? Yes?!

Tsarevich Alexei was gentle and compliant in everything that was not of principle for him ... Which is rather a sign of a strong character and, in general, the property of a strong, self-confident person. "You want to go around the tree on the right, and I on the left, but it's not at all difficult for me to go around it on the right, if it's more pleasant for you ..."

But where important moments for him were touched upon, the prince knew how to go to the end. For example, he did not participate in his father's drunkenness, and if he was present, he did not drink much wine. Didn't like wine? No, he knew the taste of wine from the age of 10. But

did not feel pleasure, getting drunk to the point of obscuration of the mind, and considered this occupation sinful.

Well, Tsarevich Alexei was rarely at the assemblies, and if he was, he drank only moderately. Is it easy to be sober for several hours among drunks?! Those who wish can try, but I hasten to assure you, reader, this is an extremely difficult matter. If Alexei really were so weak-willed, miserable, weak, he would not be able to stand it; he would certainly begin to drink along with everyone, just to get away from this whole nightmare ... and relieve stress. And he, denounced as a weakling, for several hours opposes all drunkards locked in a room.

280

guarded. And the furious eyes of his father. And to the whole spirit of society, for which the assembly is the most common thing, and who does not want to accept the rules of the game is a dangerous and stupid stranger.

To behave like Alexey, you just need iron willpower!

By the way, Tsarevich Alexei never once participated in the meetings of Peter's favorite offspring: the most extravagant, the most joking and the most drunken cathedral.

Well, so - all the "comrades-in-arms of Peter", including the descendants of ancient families, the same Dolgoruky and Golitsyn, at least once, but visited the "cathedral", And Tsarevich Alexei NEVER participated in ANY meeting of the "cathedral". They called, pulled, ordered, threatened ... He showed up sick, even went to bed, but

didn't go.

By the way, isn't this the root of the old tale about the "irritability" and the "weakness of the body" of Tsarevich Alexei?! This "infirmity" itself did not in the least prevent him from galloping twenty miles on horseback to his beloved Euphrosyne, spending the night with her by no means in "bodily rest", but in the morning again galloping twenty miles and not falling asleep, but taking part in the difficult fatherly amusements .

When, already during the flight abroad, somewhere in Poland, robbers attacked the carriage, the "frail" and "frail" prince jumped out of the carriage with a sword in his hands. Perhaps the coachman saved the situation by shouting: they say, the Russian tsar is coming! Perhaps the robbers took to their heels at the mention of Peter, and not Alexei, because they did not know who exactly this "Russian Tsar" was. The spectacle of hardened criminals fleeing in panic from the mere mention of Peter ... Well, yes ... But in any case, jump out of the carriage in the middle of the night, in an unfamiliar place and against several robbers ... Alexei jumped out and even tried chase. Oh, weak-hearted and "worthless" he is ours!

One gets the feeling that "physical frailty" has become for Tsarevich Alexei an excellent way to disown any occupation that he indulges in completely.

281

did not want. In a way to survive - and at the same time stubbornly stick to your line. He bent his line extremely stubbornly, showing by no means pliability, but the most iron character!

By the way, about Efrosinya... Aleksey's character traits - both his good taste and his iron will - manifested themselves, among other things, in his personal, family life. Long before the official marriage, Alexey became interested in the serf of his first teacher, Nikifor Vyazemsky. The girl sang well in the church choir, initially this was the reason for Alexei's interest. However, it is very similar - when choosing a woman, Alexei Petrovich showed the same good taste as when choosing friends (which serves as an indirect confirmation - the blood of Roma new in him still flowed). The girl was completely uneducated, barely knew the letter, but, having entered into a relationship with the heir to the throne, she quickly began to study; it is known that she read books that Alexey recommended to her. Already in Germany, she mastered the German language to such an extent that she could correspond with Alexei Petrovich in German.

Let's not forget that at the beginning of the 17th century, a girl, giving herself up to "not twisted, not married", committed an act more than risky. Society had every right to consider her "fallen" and put an end to her, regardless of the motives of the act. The "fallen" girl completely depended only on the will and decency of the one with whom her fate brought her. The Church very unequivocally frightened such "harlots" of fiery hell, and yet there were few atheists in the world then ... A completely licentious girl, "God forgive me," who put an end to herself and her female fate, could get in touch. Or a girl who fell deeply in love.

It is very difficult to evaluate people after 300 years, all the more so if neither Ephrosinya's handwritten note, nor a portrait remains, if no family, neither noble nor peasant, descended from her.

But, firstly, over the many years of connection with Alexei, Efrosinya remained faithful to him - despite the fact that during these eight

282

married at the behest of his father and buried his wife. By no means was she a dissolute woman.

This is not Peter's second wife, Marta-Ekaterina, felt under more than one cart.

Secondly, Efrosinya was treated well by such smart and experienced people as Prince Dmitry Mikhailovich Golitsyn or Emperor Karl \1. Even if we assume that Alexei Petrovich, being blinded by love, did not notice her bad qualities, then one cannot say the same about these people. Again, tell me who your friend is.

A very characteristic feature - already in Soviet times, Tsarevich Alexei was condemned for the fact that he had dropped his royal dignity by contacting a woman of "low birth". The historians of the tsarist time had the intelligence and tact not to put this bare on the line to Alexei. In any case, there is nothing further from the image of the real Euphrosyne than the image of a fearful wild woman, bred in the film "Peter |.

Perhaps, in the behavior of Euphrosyne, some traits of a woman who was by no means brought up in a palace were affected, but, in any case, Emperor Karl \1 after dinner and a conversation in the company of Alexei and Efrosinya, he found that she "fully corresponds to her position in society." The emperor, as you can see, assessed the personal qualities, and not the blueness of the blood of the woman with whom Alexei fled abroad ... Truly, there is no more terrible zealot with verbal decency than yesterday's lackey, who climbed into the place of the master.

But pay attention - what an enviable fidelity! Alexei was very young, at the age of 20, he chose a girl according to his heart and remained faithful to her until his very end, up to 28 years.

In fact, the heirs to the Russian throne could well marry Russian haws. But, firstly, then on the hawthorns, and not at all on the serf peasant women, even if they sing well. And secondly, times are changing, and Peter wanted to be related to all of Europe. In 1711, he ordered his son to marry Sophia-Charlotte, crown

283

Princess of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, sister-in-law of the Austrian Emperor Karl \1 ("in her family would everyone be a king ....). Alexei did not like the princess, he asked his father to "fire" him, then he asked permission to choose from several brides. Peter remained adamant and forced his son to marry of his choice.

The marriage was by no means fictitious, and in 1714 a daughter, Natalya, was born, in 1715, a son, Peter. But here's what's interesting... Experience shows that for the majority of people the proverb "be patient - fall in love" turns out to be quite real. Even in a loveless, forced marriage



they get used to each other and "calm down".

But Alexei did not leave Efrosinya all these years! He did not have any "tolerate - fall in love" in the factory. It was a man who makes his life and destiny the way he himself wanted, and not as his father, laws and circumstances imposed on him. No, Tsarevich Alexei Petrovich was anything but a weak-willed person! He possessed simply an iron will and colossal psychological vitality...

Another favorite accusation: Tsarevich Alexei was not an "active nature" ... You can only do it with your hands! And what, did the prince have the opportunity to show himself in activity?! All that remains is to tie a person hand and foot, throw him to the ground, and then wonder why he doesn't walk like all people?!

The fact of the matter is that if Tsarevich Alexei did something, he did something quite well. But the fate of the prince let go of the opportunity to show himself

very few...

The unkind myth of Peter's supporters is exposed even by portraits of the prince. They show the face of a smart, subtle guy with a "mobile" soul, nervous and with an excellent sense of humor. Portraits of Peter, frankly, do not reflect such qualities. Rather, they reflect arrogance, lack of intelligence, a pathological lack of a sense of humor, stupid complacency.

From the pages of old documents and from portraits, a very attractive image of a mentally healthy person arises.

284

a bright and intelligent person, well educated and attractive. A kind, sympathetic, gentle person, not inclined to assert himself in trifles; a man who did not prove his significance to himself and to subordinates and dependents, but where a matter of principle arose for him, he knew how to go to the end (like his grandfather, Alexei Mikhailovich).

In essence, any mature man who has tested himself and life would like to have a son similar to Alexei. It seems that it would be nice to have a daughter-in-law who looks like Efrog blue.

Another thing is that father and son have developed as extremely different people; so much so that it would be difficult for them to get along under absolutely any circumstances. But still, until 1715, the relationship between father and son was, although not close, but without much friction, without hints of a possible tragedy.

On October 22, 1715, Sophia Charlotte died. Alek-

this one grieved at her death, wept, even fainted. On October 27, she was buried in the Peter and Paul Cathedral. On the same day - no earlier, no later, the same day! - Peter hands him a letter, entitled: "Announcement to my son."

This letter describes for the first time the entire set of accusations against Alexei; Peter accuses him of laziness, of an evil and stubborn disposition. True, it does not require anything - it accuses, and that's it! The letter is dated 11 October. Why was Peter so slow? Why handed the letter on such a day?!

A possible reason is that on October 12, 1715, Alexei's son Peter was born. Ekaterina, on the other hand, is in the middle of a pregnancy, a baby is due soon... On October 28, she gives birth to a son, also named Peter. So, two Peters, son and grandson. And the son-heir from an unloved wife, not close and even, apparently, unpleasant. The second son, from his beloved wife, with whom Peter will no longer repeat the mistakes of his youth, will bring him up in the "necessary" spirit. He won't bring up himself - there will be someone to bring the guy up to date, now Peter is not alone, behind him is a whole ton of associates, and his wife now thinks the same way with him ...

285

One way or another, with or without Ekaterina's help, this is the choice Peter must make | choice between two sons. Already during Peter's lifetime, few people doubted that the "new nobility", primarily Ekaterina and Menshikov, tried very hard to persuade Peter to this particular choice, in favor of the second, youngest son. And before it happened that the second royal wife pushed the legitimate heir aside so that her child would sit on the throne. There are good reasons to believe that Sophia Palaiologos, the second wife of Ivan 1], poisoned his eldest son from his first marriage, also Ivan. Therefore, the subsequent dynasty of Russian tsars was conducted from her son, Vasily ...

And that Natalia Narysh poisoned Peter's father and brother  
kina.

There are examples from the history of other dynasties, peoples and states.

Could Catherine have done the same? Undoubtedly! Moreover, it is difficult to find a better time for intrigue than the birth of a new heir ... So that the tsar-father would have no doubts, he would destroy his hateful son with a clear conscience - and without him there is someone to sit on the throne ... But there was another aspect. .. "Aspect" was called Alexander Menshikov, and all the "supporters of reforms" and "Peter's assistants" stood behind him. That motley, variegated pack of people who were united by one thing - they all made a career, as they say, at any cost ... literally gnawed it out with their teeth. All of them fabulously enriched themselves by robbing what today is called the "state

property" and "budget".

For these people, any change in the state course ... and not even a change in course, strictly speaking, but a change in them personally at the helm of this course meant the end of absolutely everything. These people did not make their careers through their talents, education, knowledge, or hard work. They became courtiers because, pleasing Peter, they carried out absolutely any of his orders, guessed his every desire and caught on the fly any royal emotion. Any impartial ascertainment of their professional suitability would not allow them to advance beyond the

286

nogo army major ... and then in the very, very best case. Any serious examination of the sources of their wealth meant the confiscation of their wealth. The coming to power of Alexei would have meant to them the same thing as a revolution for the ruling class. The personal and official qualities of these people were such that they could not fail to fall.

But behind Alexei there were also all sorts of people ... Long-armed and Golitsyns. Adamant, proud of a pedigree dating back to the Middle Ages, looking with squeamish expressions at the antics of official lackeys. If Aleksey is in power, then after all, Dmitry Mikhailovich Golitsyn will not become the governor of Kyiv, and Yakov Fedorovich Dolgoruky will take some completely different place in the state ...

And it turns out that crushing Alexei Petrovich, destroying him as surely as possible becomes a matter of personal salvation for a large group of people united around Ekaterina and Alexander Danilovich Menshikov. The position of the king himself, who disliked his son more and more, greatly facilitated their intrigue.

Not knowing how to behave, Alexei turns to his acquaintances for advice... And for a mature man who has entered the full age of a man, fighting with his own father is not such a great happiness. Alexei, after all, is only 25 years old. He is advised to abdicate the throne - therefore, people disposed towards Alexei perfectly understand why Peter suddenly became so angry. On October 31, 3 days after the birth of Peter Petrovich from Catherine, Alexei sends a letter to his father in which he abdicates the throne: "And now, thank God, I have a brother, to whom God grant health."

As you can see, Alexei is also quite frank and calls things, albeit politely, but quite by their proper names. It seems that Peter's goal has been achieved ... But still not achieved with everything. Die Peter, and many very influential people will not even want to hear about Alexei's abdication! Then the renounced Alexei may not fulfill his father's will

after the death of Peter. He is still dangerous to Menshikov, Eka

287

Terine, their entire stratum of political nominees. Alexei has an unseen position - he is dangerous not because he takes some position or does something or does not do it. It is dangerous because it exists in the world.

On January 19, 17716, Alexei receives a new letter from Peter: "The last reminder yet." The letter contains the same accusations of "unfitness" and the demand to be tonsured as a monk. "And if you don't do it, then I will deal with you, as with a villain."

Alexei again consults with his entourage ... Most advise - to get a haircut as a monk! But as it is not difficult to guess, not at all because they want to bury Alexei alive in some remote monastery. The goal is to outplay Menshikov and Ekaterina, to get Alexei out of the fire.

- And the hood, - Alexander Kikin frankly declares, - after all, it is not nailed to the head, you can take it off.

Alexei expresses a desire to go to the monastery. Like the problem is solved? It wasn't there! The prince is right and not in a hurry to take the tonsure. Hopes for softening of the father? Doesn't want to be in the future a banished tsar who threw off his monastic hood? Don't trust your father? How to know...

In September 1716, Alexei receives a new letter. A letter was sent from Copenhagen, demanding that he immediately leave for the army or go to a monastery ... also immediately.

Struggling to whitewash Peter, historians write such, for example, amazing things: "Peter ... repeatedly demanded that Alexei Petrovich break with the reactionary clergy surrounding him and opponents of the reforms carried out by Peter". This is the absolute lie; there are no demands in the letters to "break" or change the line of behavior with someone. In general, no specific accusations, no claims on the merits. Claims descend to the level of primitive abuse. In the spirit of "ray

1 Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Issue 3. T. 1. M., 1970. Article "Alexey Petrovich". S. 418.

288

Be someone else's good than your own indecent. Maybe this is what scares Alexei the most, the evidence

vaya - no matter what he does, no matter how he demonstrates his loyalty, but there is no salvation for him: he exists - and thus doomed.

The utterly frightened prince decides to run away. Having reached Danzig (modern Gdansk), he ... disappeared. Turning sharply to the south, the prince went to Vienna, where powerful relatives of his first wife live. The name has been changed - now it is not Tsarevich Alexei who rides in this carriage, but the Polish gentry Kokhansky. Alexei Petrovich turned to the Austrian emperor with a request for asylum and patronage. He very frankly explains why he is forced to flee: "My father is surrounded by evil people, extremely hard-hearted and bloodthirsty. He thinks that he, like God, has the right to human life, shed a lot of innocent blood, even often laying his hand on the unfortunate sufferers. In addition, he is incredibly angry and vindictive, does not spare any person, and if the emperor betrays me to his father, it is all the same that he will take my life. If my father had spared me, then my stepmother and Menshikov would not calm down until they made me drunk or poisoned me.

That is why Alexei "came to ask the emperor ... to save my life: they want to destroy me, they want to deprive me and my poor children of the throne." As you can see, neither the background nor the driving belts of the intrigue are at all a secret for Alexei.

Austrian relatives hide Alexei in Tyrol, in the Ehrenberg castle. And on time! Peter, having learned from his resident Veselovsky that the tsarevich is in Vienna, immediately sends to this city the captain of the guard Rumyantsev (father of Rumyantsev-Zadunaisky, the famous winner of the Turks) and four guards officers with the order: to seize Alesei and transport him to Russia!

Alexei and Efrosinya are sent away from sin to Naples and placed in the almost impregnable castle of San Elmo. And on the heels of the fugitives are Peter's confidants: Rumyantsev and Count Pyotr Andreevich Tolstoy.

289

In September 1771, they managed to meet with Alexei and gave him a letter from Peter. In this letter, Peter promised his son "by God and His judgment" that there would be no punishment. It will be, "if you obey my will and return." Everything was used: persuasion, flattery, deceit. Pyotr Andreevich Tolstoy did his best to persuade Efrosinya: they say, if the fugitives agree to return, they will live quietly, in the village, no one will touch them.

Alexei Petrovich did not give in: apparently, he had a very good idea with whom he was dealing. If he had held out, it is difficult to say how the further Russian history would have developed. But then Tolstoy found

an erroneous move ... He managed to bribe the secretary of the Viceroy of Neapolitan Weingard, and this man officially informed the prince that the Viennese court was allegedly going to extradite him to Russia, to Tsar Peter. Tsarevich Alexei believed in this lie, and the chronicle of further events is as follows.

On October 3, Alexey told Tolstoy and Rumyantsev that he agreed to return to Russia if his father "forgave" him and allowed him to marry Efrosinya. The promise was made in the form of the most solemn oaths, and in January 1718 Alexei and Efrosinya returned to their homeland.

On February 3, they were arrested, and on the same day, in the Kremlin Palace, Peter declared his son's "guilt" to the assembled senators. Among other things, the senators were told about the existence of a whole "conspiracy" headed by Alexei. It was reported that in the "chamber" Aleksey confessed to everything and named "accomplices". In a strange way, the "accomplices" who seemed to have already been "issued" by Alexei were never named; I think there is no point in explaining for a long time - why did Peter suddenly show such amazing restraint?!

However, on the same day, February 3, 1718, with a special manifesto, Alexei was removed from the throne as a "traitor" and "conspirator", and Peter Petrovich, Catherine's son, was proclaimed heir.

Soon they arrested those whom Alexei "pointed to": Alexander Kikin, Nikifor Vyazemsky, Princess Ma

290

Riya Alekseevna. It seems that it was never reported that the prince named Yakov Ignatiev and Abram Lopukhin, but they were also arrested. |

It seems that the goal has been achieved ... But not quite! This whole "conspiracy" is already very ephemeral, frivolous. If Menshikov, Pyotr and Ekaterina want to be believed, they need to concoct a more serious "case". People who had the imprudence to be close to Alexei are being brought to Preobrazhenskoye. An interesting thing is that they are shouting loudly that Tsarevich Alexei "spoke" and "turns over the conspirators" one by one. But among these "pro-conspirators" there is not a single really serious, major figure in the state! Not a single political figure from whom the conspiracy could acquire at least some real significance. Nobody touches D.M. Golitsina. Nobody asks a single question to Ya.F. For a long time to whom. After all, these are large figures, a lot is entrusted to them, and it makes no sense to take them on an obviously false case. If they really did start a conspiracy, they would try to overthrow Peter - not to take off the heads of either one or the other. And so, if the conspiracy is not real, to repress even annoying, but valuable, useful people ... is it worth it?

Is it possible to imagine Alexei Petrovich spinning a thread of political intrigue, not trying to find a common language with Dolgoruky, but drawing his valet into the conspiracy?! It's crazy to even think about it.

Meanwhile, Alexei Petrovich is being tortured almost continuously. Blood-stained leaflets are carried out of the torture chambers, full of the names of people "named prince". But all this is his valet, housekeeper, former tsar's orderly Alexander Kikin ... in a word, all the same unfortunate conspirators. All of them irritate the tsar and his close people, all of them are "suitable" for the role of extras in the conspiracy - to show how great the conspiracy was, how many traitors Aleksey Petrovich rallied around himself.

They also torture all these "named" ones. Listen to the combination of words: "many court ladies were beaten with batogs." The combination is quite in the spirit of "an ax floated along the river" or "burned

291

ice." But all this is true, regardless of our current emotions about it. During the investigation into the "case" of Alexei Petrovich, many court ladies were beaten. dungeons with batogs. Someone could not stand it, slandered himself and others, the machine began to work more than once

stroke.

They also get to the mother of the terrible criminal Alexei, Evdokia Lopukhina. To the delight of the investigators, a no less monstrous crime was discovered behind her - sent into exile at the age of 26, she made a dear friend, Major Glebov. This is not a betrayal of the king, not adultery at all - Evdokia has long been no longer a husband's wife. But not all of Peter's decisions can be considered the decisions of a sane person. Even though he does not need Evdokia at all - but an attempt has been made on his property! Glebov is tortured with red-hot iron and coals, tortured with a whip, but he does not give the investigators new clues to the conspiracy. Perhaps he is glad to be saved from torment, but he himself does not know whom to name; does not understand what they want from him?

Glebov is put on a stake under the windows of Lopukhina's cell: so that she can see! So that Glebov does not die too quickly, Peter personally, who loved to go into details so much, was ordered to put on a hat and a fur coat - so that he would live and suffer. Glebov dies 18 hours under the windows of Lopukhina, the hateful queen and mother of the hateful Tsarevich Alexei.

By the way, Evdokia's love letters to Mayor Glebov have been preserved. They are very warm, caring, kind, showing the far from empty soul of a woman who, with the light hand of A. Tolstoy, is supposed to be considered almost a clinical fool. But Peter's ex-wife's ability to love someone led to monkey fury ...

Alexander Kikin is wheeled and, in order to prolong the torment, they first cut off his arms, then his legs, then his head, and impale this head on a stake. Archbishop Dositheus is also wheeled, who treated Lopukhina well and did not inform about her connection with Major Glebov.

Peter personally interrogates Alexei and Efrosinya in Peterhof, where they are secretly brought in a closed wagon.

292

Despite all efforts, the investigation comes to a complete dead end. There is absolutely no evidence that Tsarevich Alexei betrayed the Russian Empire, committed some terrible deeds. There is not even proof that the conspiracy itself existed, let alone the desire to "ask for an army" from the Austrian emperor and unleash a war between the Austrian Empire and Russia, or Alexei's desire to "exterminate" his father. There are only evasive, vague words, uttered under torture: "If the rioters ever called me," he could lead the conspiracy. Note that even here he does not admit that someone has already called him somewhere. So, a theoretical assumption, and even then it is not known whether it was uttered by Alexei or invented by the executioners along with the names of the "conspirators".

The main part of Aleksey's "testimony" is slander against himself. "To my father's disobedience and that he didn't want to do what he pleases, the reason is that from infancy he lived with his mother and with the girls, where he did not learn anything other than private fun, but learned more to be hypocritical, why should I prone by nature." Alexei also reported about himself that the teaching was "very disgusting to him and he repaid it with great laziness, only so that time would pass in it, but he had no desire for it." And that he is "very devoid of memory, and greatly weakened by mental and bodily powers from various diseases."

We already know that these embarrassing "confessions" are lies, all lies from start to finish. If this kind of nonsense is squeezed out of him, then only with one goal - to obtain evidence of the squalor, the insignificance of the prince, to justify the reprisal against him. On these "testimonies" and on the lies of the direct killers of Alexei Petrovich, the unkind myth about him rests.

The investigation comes to a dead end... And then Peter commits an act so pharisaic, so unbelievable that one can believe in him even less than in flogging court ladies with batogs. Peter sends two letters, to the secular and spiritual officials of the empire, and asks them for advice: "I am afraid of God so as not to sin, for it is natural that people see less in their affairs than others in them. Takozh

293



and physicians, although 6 and more skillful than all who were, do not dare to treat their own illness, but call on others.

It is believed that the spiritual hierarchs answered evasively: they say, let Peter decide for himself whether to judge his son according to the Old or the New Testament. Judging by the Old One, Aleksey should be executed. If according to the New, then forgive, for Christ forgave the repentant "prodigal son" and let the "prodigal wife" go. In fact, the clergy did everything possible, appealing to the conscience of the king and even to his belonging to the church. After all, if you are a Christian, then the New Testament should be much more authoritative for you. If you judge your son according to the Old Testament, then it turns out that you are acting according to the morals of the ancient prophets, and

your dignity is doubtful...

The secular ranks behave incomparably less worthily: 127 members of a special commission unanimously vote for the death penalty of Alexei. And at this time even the charge has not been formulated! The commission itself formulates: they say, Alexei "intended to seize the throne through the rebels, through foreign Caesar's help and foreign troops, with the ruin of the entire state." In the future, it is this formula that will be used to justify Peter and condemn Alexei. Here, they say, that's what I wanted to do! But all that has been said is not at all the result of the work of the investigation, not the recognition of Alexei Petrovich. He said nothing of the sort about himself. All this, from beginning to end, is an invention of a special commission created by Peter specifically for the trial of his son.

Of course, it is very clear to everyone - both Peter and Alexei, and the members of the commission - that there is simply nothing to accuse Alexei of and that he is not to blame for anything. Both during and after the meeting of the special commission, they continue to torture him terribly - perhaps he himself will tell you how to "sew" him on charges of treason?! The verdict was passed on June 24, 1718. But on June 25 and 26 Alexei was again tortured; July 26 - in the presence of Peter. What was discussed this time, what the son hanging on the rack and the father standing in front of him said to each other, we do not know.

294

On the same day, July 26, "in the afternoon at 6 o'clock, being under guard, Tsarevich Alexei reposed." According to the official version, Aleksei died of a "cruel illness, which at first was similar to apoplexy." This is how the cause of Alexei's death was explained to the ambassadors of foreign states. In St. Petersburg, they immediately started talking about the fact that the prince could not stand the torment and died "from exhaustion." They also said that the veins were opened to the prince. And that Peter cut off his head with his own hand. No one believed that the death of the prince was natural.

A letter from Alexander Rumyantsev has been preserved, in which he told how he, Buturlin, Tolstoy and Ushakov strangled the prince with pillows. Whether it was true or Rumyantsev wanted to boast of Peter's trust in him and the fulfillment of important assignments, it is difficult to say.

Involuntarily, a suspicion arises - was not Peter afraid of a public execution? Was he not afraid that his "weakhearted" son might shout from the scaffold? Perhaps there was also a direct threat from Alexei - after all, we don't know what Peter and Alexei talked about a few hours before the son was strangled by the "father's" closest henchmen.

The day after Alexei's death, Peter accepted congratulations on the occasion of the anniversary of the Battle of Poltava, then had a solemn dinner and fun. Before Alexei's burial, he celebrated his name day and marked the launching of the new ship with cheerful fireworks. However, Peter probably really had reason to rejoice: after all, he managed to outwit his already seemingly runaway, almost saved son and kill him!

It probably makes sense to say about the fate of Euphrosyne. They crossed the border of Muscovy separately: Efrosinya was pregnant and could not travel fast. And the emissaries of Peter urged Tsarevich Aleksey as much as they could: faster! Faster (suddenly changes his mind, does not want to return?!). Then Pyotr personally interrogated Efrosinya several times: always separately from Alexei, they were not given a confrontation.

Since then, Euphrosyne has disappeared from all historical sources. No mention anywhere! Alexei sprang

295

talked about her, but what they answered him is unknown. It is logical to assume that Peter "removed" an unnecessary, dangerous witness, but historians just consider this unlikely. At that time in Rus' it was not considered necessary to kill even the most unpleasant witnesses and to execute even political opponents. Tradition prescribed sending them to monasteries. No one in today's Russia knows what kind of life she lived and where, when this outstanding woman closed her eyes for the last time. Is it on the White Sea, in Pustozersk, in Suzdal? Efrosinya simply disappeared, "dissolved", as if she had never existed.

And the child? We don't know about him, even if he was born (if Efrosinya was tortured, she most likely threw her out). If he was born, it is not even known what gender he (the child) was: a boy or a girl? If the baby was immediately taken from Efrosinya and given to an orphanage or to some family, then the baby could well survive, and it is very possible that his descendants - another branch of the Romanov family - still exist in Russia. It's funny to think that the author of these

lines, and almost every one of his readers. It is pleasant to think that the seed of these worthy people can exist in our world - against the will of a bastard and son-killer exalted as a mental and spiritual giant.

I have no doubt that not one or two of the readers of my book, especially people who have adult sons ... adult children in general, are now experiencing some kind of awkwardness ... No, it is difficult for me to put into words this yearning of the spirit! I myself experience excruciating embarrassment. For the fact that in the sublunar world such a thing is generally possible. For the fact that an absolutely innocent person accepted a terrible death. Because the sky didn't open. Before the fact that I myself have adult sons, and God forbid, from reading all this bastard abomination created by Peter the Great, it may come to their mind that their father is capable of such a thing ...

I have told this story to several very different people, and they all began to experience this vague anxiety ... So, in a way

296

Dimomu, this state is natural and normal for every sane person.

Peter never had a conscience? He never remembered his vows to his son?! I can't vouch for anything, of course... But, let's say, we don't have any information about these pangs of Peter's conscience. Decidedly none. In any case, it was he and his entourage who let and continued to spread the myth about Tsarevich Alexei all their lives, which has survived to our time, manifesting itself in such harmful and dangerous works of art as the painting by Ge or the film "Peter \ ..

Yes! And Pyotr Petrovich, Peter's son by Catherine, in whose favor Alexei renounced... He died less than a year after the execution of Tsarevich Alexei. And in general, from Ekaterina, Peter did not have any boys left alive.

Chapter 2  
THE WIFE OF THE ANTICHRIST

There is nothing better than a good wife, But  
there can be nothing worse than a bad one.

Hesiod

One of the most extravagant, most "Petrine" in spirit deeds for all 32 years of the reign - an official marriage with Catherine. Still would! On the throne of the Russian

kings of kings - a stray girl from the Baltics; taken "on a sword" in a captured fortress, felted under carts by drunken soldiers. The very thing that is needed to frighten the boyars, to establish a simple thought in society - the tsar can do whatever he wants. He is not limited by anyone and nothing, he does not answer to anyone. And it is not the business of the courtiers, it is not the business of anyone to "discuss" about royal affairs.

It is widely believed that Tsar Peter was very happy with Catherine, loved her very much and that she managed to give the Tsar the warmth of a home. In fact, quite a few of their letters have been preserved, almost 170, and they are all warm, homely, without the slightest semblance of business correspondence. And yet, the same letters are quoted from book to book.

"Katerinushka, my friend, hello! I hear that you are bored, and I am not without boredom, but we can reason that there is no need to change things for boredom.

298

Ekaterina's letter is also often cited, in which she recalled her role as a washerwoman: "Even though you have some new port, you still don't forget the old one."

V.V. Mavrodin tells about the relationship of this couple in completely idyllic tones: "Uneducated, but by nature not stupid, cheerful and undemanding, affectionate and kind, she was the complete opposite of Evdokia Lopukhina. She entered her husband's life and lived in his interests. His sorrows were her sorrows, his joys her joys. In a sincere conversation, Peter shared with her all his worries, knowing that he would always find a warm, friendly response, affection and consolation from her.

Spouses, if they parted, then not for long. Despite the fact that Catherine gave birth to 12 children, despite the pregnancy and feeding, she constantly accompanied Peter on trips. Usually two trains were equipped, and Catherine's train always struck with luxury, while Peter himself did not like special luxury.

Catherine was always present at celebrations and festivities, not setting off her husband, but standing behind him, among the celebrating and triumphant. She knew how to be present, and Peter seemed to enjoy it.

Peter could, with her, and even with her participation, and make assemblies, and dirty tricks in the All-Drunken Cathedral, and show his tough temper, and joke. Catherine accepted everything, and accepted it in such a way that Peter felt pleased.

A story has been preserved about a prank that Peter arranged in the first year of the existence of St.

Dutch captain. That captain brought his ship to Petersburg, and Peter personally performed the work of a pilot, brought the ship into the mouth of the Neva. He introduced himself as "pilot Peter", and while he was navigating the ship, he and the captain met, drank rum, and almost became friends.

Peter invited the captain to his place to "dry off", received him very well, introduced him to his wife. The captain, feeling emotional, presented Catherine with canvases "for shirts",

`Mavrodin V.V. The birth of a new Russia. L., 1988. S. 188. 299

and Peter commented: "In shirts made of such a canvas, Katya, you will be like an empress!" Then Menshikov appeared, dressed up as a court dandy, and began to report to Peter. The captain was embarrassed, realizing that his new friend occupies a completely different position in society. But Peter managed to convince him that in St. Petersburg very often pilots and captains can be short-lived with the courtiers. And the prank, already with the participation of Menshikov, continued until a certain officer appeared and began to report to Peter in full form.

Only then did the Dutchman finally realize that he had been "cheated", he became very upset and began to ask for forgiveness and take gifts. It wasn't there! Peter did not give away the gifts, but drilled the silver ruble given to him "for vodka" and hung it around his neck like a talisman. And he gave the Dutch captain very generously. So that he will remember for the rest of his life not only his adventure, but also how profitable it is to sail to Petersburg.

Indeed, with Evdokia Lopukhina, such a game would not work. Catherine willingly played the pilot's wife. It may very well be that for her, too, it was entertainment, similar to Peter's favorite game of "Herr Pieter, the carpenter of Zaandamsky." After all, women, too, are not all so eager to be empresses. Maybe the peasant girl Katerina Skavroschuk, who was brought up in the philistine house of pastor Gluck, was also closer to marrying a reiter or a small merchant?

According to the Brunswick envoy Weber, Peter especially appreciated Catherine because she "always knew how to portray the empress", although she "remembered very well that she was not born by her."

It seems that the letters sound convincing, and the facts set in favor of an almost generally accepted opinion: an idyll reigned around the throne! Yes, only ... But no, more on that later, until it would be bad to find out - who was she, Ekaterina? Roughly speaking, where did this woman come from?

The history of Catherine is well known since August 25, 1702, from the assault on the Swedish fortress of Marienburg.

300

The fortress was built back in knightly times in the middle of Lake Aluksne, in modern Latvia. The fortress was connected with the shore of the lake by a bridge on stone pillars. During the siege, the decking of the bridge was dismantled, and the stone pillars, of course, remained.

The Russians managed to break through the fortress wall with cannons, and a whole flotilla of rafts and boats went to the island. The Swedes threw out the white flag, negotiations began on the surrender, and the civilian population began to move along the somehow induced bridge deck. And at this time, two Swedish officers, Lieutenant Wolf and bayonet junker Goth Schlich, blew up the powder magazines. The explosion was so terrible that the stones of the fortress began to fall even into the lake and onto those who were climbing over the remains of the bridge.

There are two versions of what happened next, but they differ little. According to one version, Russian soldiers began to seize people and divide them - who should take them into slavery and take away their property. Ekaterina got one of them ...

According to the second version, Catherine fell into the lake, she was pushed off the bridge by people rushing about under a hail of stones. She began to shout in Russian: "Soldier, help!" And one Russian soldier pulled her out of the lake.

Later versions differ in such minor details that they can be ignored. For example, whether she was a short-term mistress of only one soldier who pulled her out of the lake, or several, moving from one to another. Did the soldiers themselves sell it to Field Marshal Sheremetev for a silver ruble, or did Sheremetev notice it and take it away from the soldiers on his own initiative?

The main thing is that she ended up in the house of an elderly, 50-year-old Sheremetev, thereby immediately making a dizzying sexual career - from a one-time soldier slut to the concubine of the commander in chief.

Then the different versions start arguing again. Either the field marshal himself from a great mind boasted of a concubine to Menshikov, or Menshikov was

301

from Field Marshal Sheremetev and spotted Catherine, bartered her from Boris Petrovich for three rubles and for an "English" saber.

Again, the main thing is that she ended up with Menshikov, continuing the same incredible, dizzying

career. And here different versions finally disappear, because it is known for sure that Menshikov himself told about Katerina Petra and himself offered to "try" her. It was already the deaf autumn of 1702, in Moscow.

But who was she, this amazing woman, who at the age of 18 managed to charm the then 30-year-old, experienced ... yes, simply speaking, simply dissolute Peter?! A woman who must have had something - otherwise how could she have made this dizzying, implausible career?! All the more incredible that Ekaterina was certainly not an experienced courtesan who had long learned to master the passions of "her" men. Such an incredibly experienced, extremely cold and in her own way very smart whore was, for example, Theodora, a theater actress UNDER the "glorious" name of Pornai. In \!| century BC she managed to become a concubine, then the married wife of Emperor Justinian.

The story of Catherine is clearly a completely different story, and therefore it is especially mysterious.

In Marienburg, Ekaterina lived in the servants of a German, pastor Gluck, she was a Lutheran, and her name was Marta. Whether for this reason or for another, but in old Russia it was supposed to consider her either a German or a Latvian - which all the major historians of the 17th and 20th centuries agree on.

However, the German origin of Martha was called into question a very long time ago ... because the maiden name of this woman is known - Skavronskaya, or Skovoronskaya. There is also a version that her last name was Skav Roschuk.

In addition to the classical German version, there are at least four versions of who these Skavronskys were. The first version is that Martha

302

was the daughter of the "Lithuanian peasant Samuil Skavronsky".

"According to the majority of historians, Martha came from a large Latvian Skavronsky family, who were in serfdom from the Polish landowner"? So is she Lithuanian or Latvian?! Or do you compile textbooks confuse Latvians and Lithuanians?! Right, it's completely wrong...

Estonians also quite seriously consider Ekaterina "their own". Peter laid out a park in Reval-Tallinn, named after her, and this Kadriorg (Katrin's garden) still exists.

In general, there is no people in the Baltic states who would not try to impose their own independent rule on Catherine.

ku. Who is she?!

The Soviet writer Alexei Tolstoy in the novel "Peter I" Ekaterina, even after a year of living in Russia, still speaks Russian with an accent. In my opinion, this is absolutely incredible - after all, people do not speak with an accent in their native language.

In Soviet times, the most accurate, but at the same time, the most streamlined indication of the origin of Ekaterina was given by V.V. Mavrodin: "The daughter of a peasant comes from Lithuania"<sup>3</sup>. At that time, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was inhabited by about 4 million Russian people, about a million Poles and fifteen hundred Lithuanians proper. Why it was impossible to call a spade a spade, what kind of ideological prohibition hung over this - I do not understand. But even without calling Catherine directly Russian, Vladi Mir Vasilyevich did it in such a way that it is impossible not to understand: "The daughter of a peasant, originally from Lithuania" ... Extremely

It's clear.

Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Issue. 3. T. 9. M., 1972. Article "Catherine I". S. 75.

2 Yurganov A.L., Katsva L.A. History of Russia XVIII-XVII centuries. M., 1996. S. 256.

3 Mavrodin V.V. The birth of a new Russia. L., 1988. S. 188. 303

Moreover. The Skavronskys came from near Minsk, and they were called, before fleeing to the Baltic states, Skavroschuks; so there is every reason to consider Ekaterina a Belorussian. Samuil Skavroschuk was "in a fortress" with a Polish landowner and fled to the possession of the Swedes: although the Swedes did not abolish serfdom in Livonia, they considered those who arrived free and were never allowed into the Commonwealth.

Incidentally, the Polonized White Russian nobles, the Counts of Skavronsky, are well known. They appeared in St. Petersburg in the 1710s, causing confusion in the courtiers: are they somehow related to the mother queen?! There was even a rumor about her nephews and brothers found in Lithuanian villages...

And the Counts of Skavronsky did not belong to Catherine. They come from Smolensk, where there is still Skavronkina Gora, part of their possessions. If you follow the letter of the law, then the Skavronsky counts had every right to seize the "empress" and make her their serf again: after all, it was possible to look for fugitives and their descendants forever, without time limit ... Funny jokes history jokes!



The suspicion involuntarily arises that the runaway serf Skavroschuk Polonized his surname and became Pan Skavronsky precisely during his flight, as if thereby climbing the social ladder. However, even without any game of "pandom" he had money. A manor near Marienburg was rented, and on this manor four brothers and three sisters were born, all full-blooded Skavroschuks.

Then, alas, there was a plague, the Lord took away the father and elder brother, the heir. Then Martha-Ekaterina was taken into service by a pastor from Marienburg, Peter Gluck. Apparently, he already knew the Skavroschun family.

It is not known when Martha-Ekaterina passed into a fierce position. A girl from Western Rus' could not possibly be a Lutheran. Marta-Katerina could have been baptized in Catholicism, in Orthodoxy, and most likely in the Uniate

304

church. From which it follows that even before she converted to Orthodoxy in Russia, she had already changed her religion once. More than likely, her restraint in everything that concerns her life before Marienburg and before life in the servants of pastor Gluck is connected with this. Most likely, the good pastor baptized Martha-Catherine into Lutheranism. Whether she changed her name is unclear. When rebaptizing, they often left the name, guessed the performance of the ceremony on such a day in order to leave the person of the former heavenly patron. Martha could well have been Martha before her baptism into Lutheranism, and there was no need to get used to another name. Or maybe she had some completely different name.

In any case, until the end of her days, Catherine considered Pater Gluck her "second father" and kept the warmest memories of his house, "where there was enough work, but there was also a lot of good things." Father Gluck found a husband for the orphan and gave her a dowry. Catherine was married to the royal dragoon Johann Kruse.

V.V. Mavrodin assures that he went to war on the very first day and went missing. This is pure myth-making. The Swedish garrison of Marienburg did not leave the fortress, Kruse did not think of going anywhere or disappearing. Martha stayed at Pastor Gluck's house, because the young people simply did not have time to start their own household. The wedding was celebrated on Ivanov's Day, July 6, 1702. Catherine also remembered this event very warmly, as a romantic event. It was a clear, warm day, one of the longest of the year, the girls adorned the bride with water lilies from the lake and sang, pastor Gluck played the violin.

A week later, Marienburg was besieged by Russian troops; On August 25, 1702, when the Russians were already entering the fortress, and the garrison was preparing to surrender, Johann Kruse

came to say goodbye to his wife. According to the old Ekaterina, already standing with one foot in the grave and pretty drunk, she herself suggested that he run away - they say, look, there are no Russians on the other side of the lake! Johann and two others

305

Swedish soldiers sailed across the lake, and, apparently, Catherine never saw him again.

However, Ekaterina indulged in all these memories already in the very last years of her life, after the death of Pyotr Alekseevich. During these two years, by which she outlived her last husband, Catherine was in a very bad physical and intellectual form. It is difficult to say what was true in these stories, what was a mistake in the memory of an elderly drunk woman. There could also be simply romantic exaggerations, inventions that adorn the memory of a blissful, bygone youth. Unfortunately, her memories are the only way to find out many details. And they do not differ in reliability, alas.

Since 1702, any mention of Johann Cruz disappears. Disappears, however, only from Russian sources. The Swedes know very well where the lawful husband of the Russian Empress went. Johann Kruse served the Swedish king for many more years, and in his old age - in the garrisons on the Åland Islands. Having served his pension, he did not go anywhere - he probably did not have close relatives, and there was simply nowhere to go. Johann also did not start a family and explained to the pastor that he already had a wife and he would not take sin on his soul. Whether Johann was one of those whom Marta-Catherine charmed beyond measure, whether his lifelong loyalty is connected with this, it is difficult to say. He outlived his legal wife, Martha Catherine, but not by much, dying in 1733.

All of the above explains very well why in tsarist times it was believed that Johann Kruse was missing.

The fate of pastor Peter Gluck is well known. A well-educated Saxon priest, who received degrees in theology and philosophy, he came to Marienburg as a missionary. Among other things, he translated the Bible into Latvian and into living Russian

306

language to preach Lutheranism among Catholics and Orthodox.

In Russian captivity, Peter Gluck became the founder of the first

secular gymnasium in Moscow and, it seems, was far ahead of his time. No one needed a general education, the intellectual potential of Gluck and the teachers discharged by him remained unclaimed. The gymnasium functioned neither shakily nor smoothly for 10 years, from 1705 to 1715, and was quietly closed, much after Pastor Gluck's death in 1704. He was already old, and his death, most likely, was natural.

There is no evidence that Peter ever met Pastor Gluck - although, of course, it was he who knew a lot about Catherine's past. Why? He believed her so much that he did not consider it necessary? Did he later regret that he did not meet with Gluck, when he began to treat Catherine more meaningfully? All these are unanswered questions.

Here it is, the first and most terrible secret of Catherine, or rather, a whole bunch of fetid secrets!

Peter's wife | there was a Russian peasant woman who was baptized into Lutheranism, and then from Lutheranism into Orthodoxy. In addition, the word "wife" in relation to her relationship with Pyotr Alekseevich is not particularly appropriate. The venerable Frau Johann Kruse, calling a spade a spade, had many lovers in Russian captivity, including the emperor, from whom she bore several children. But from the point of view of the law (and morality) nothing changes here. Marta-Catherine was the legal wife of Johann Kruse. She remained her even when Peter officially married her in 1712. She only became a woman of two, and, moreover, in the event of a trial, she was to become the wife of Johann, as the king who married her 10 years earlier.

... So it turns out that in the Russian throne in 1725-1727 there was a two-man, whose real name was Fru Johann Kruse, the married wife of a Swedish dragoon.

307

Peter's love for Catherine, apparently, is not a myth at all. The German pastor's pupil knew how to control his passions, that's a fact. But here is the second component of the myth about Ekaterin - about her great love for the king ... There is a certain strangeness in this love. Well, let's say that Peter could cheat on Catherine many times and at the same time continue to love her passionately. There is such an opinion among the people - they say, a man can love like that. But what about the multiple exchanges of Catherine herself? Even in our ... um ... um ... even in our progressive, free-thinking time, few people doubt that loving women do not sleep with just anyone, as soon as the "beloved" husband gapes.

The number of fleeting hobbies of Catherine is approaching two dozen. Of the future members of the Supreme Privy Council, only

only the pathologically cautious Osterman and Dmitry Golitsyn, who continued to look at the "mother queen" with arrogant disgust. It is unlikely that class arrogance played the main role in this disgust - after all, Dmitry Mikhailovich recognized Efrosinya and treated her very well. |

In fairness, all the connections were exactly that of a moment, lasted literally for several weeks and were not demonstrated outwardly in any way. Catherine maintained a semblance of propriety and, no doubt, wanted to save the marriage. Peter very often had no idea about her little adventures. He remained the first among her men, and one can only guess what role in this was played by his personal virtues, and what role was played by social factors. But in any case, what does love have to do with it at all?!

On the relationship of the Empress with A.D. The Menshikovs were told different things. And that, having handed Catherine over to Peter, he never touched her again. And that their relationship was not interrupted even for a month, and some of Catherine's children were born from him (if you take into account Menshikov's cohabitation with Peter, it turns out to be a good "Swedish family"). Which option is more plausible is very difficult to judge.

308

But with Willim Mons everything was clearly not so... A brilliant young employee of Catherine's personal office, Willim Mons was the younger brother of Peter's long-term "affection" of Peter, perhaps his first woman, Anna Mons. The Irony of Fate? To some extent. And yet another indicator of the incredible scarcity of people, the terrible human "crowding". The same faces flash by all the time, and the new ones most often have at least some relation to the old ones.

Upon learning of Catherine's connection with Mons, Peter was furious and, as usual, brutally cracked down on the "rival KOM." Mons was accused of embezzlement of government money; whether a crime was committed or the "case" was "sewn together" from scratch, history is still silent. Anyway, Willim Mons was beheaded. Peter, having gone for a ride around the city, did not fail to stop by the square, where the head of Mons was sticking out on a stake. According to legend, Catherine showed tremendous restraint, showing neither grief nor embarrassment, and, looking the king straight in the eyes, said: "How sad that the courtiers can have so much corruption!"

However, according to many testimonies, violent scenes took place between the spouses with mutual accusations and insults. There is also evidence that from 1724 Peter simply became impotent, and the "mother queen" finally went into all serious trouble. On the one hand, the loss of male strength at 52 is absolutely incredible,

medicine, such cases are unknown. On the other hand, drink as much aniseed vodka as Pyotr blew out, and I'll see what happens to you yourself ... In general, a dark story.

A special theme, of course, is the relationship between Catherine and Tsarevich Alexei Petrovich. It is very likely that, in addition to the struggle of the two dynastic lines, the "clans of the two wives" of the king, there was much more here. The person who chose Efrosinya could hardly relate well to Ekateri not ... and vice versa. Too different tastes appear in these elections.

309

And besides, it is very strange why no one comes up with a simple thought: that a teenager, a young man, a young man, after the breakup of his parents, can be offended not only for his mother, who was exiled to a monastery. He may also be offended for his father if his second wife loses in comparison with the first and does not even keep marital fidelity to him.

|

Ekaterina, what to do, and lost to Lopukhina - both in appearance and in the field of general culture, and did not remain faithful to him. To the extent that she understood Alexei's attitude, there was also an element of personal dislike in her own dynastic game. It must be said that some of her letters to Menshikov very clearly show this rather strong hostility.

I wonder if Peter could understand at the end of his life that he was pushed to kill his son and not the last of the "pushed" was his own wife? That, to the extent that Catherine was deliberately behind the murder of Tsarevich Alexei, she was directly responsible for the suppression of the Romanov dynasty in the direct male line? If he did, his loneliness became even more unbearable.

Of course, something, but everyone chooses a family for himself, of his own free will. But it is naive to think that the choice will have no consequences, that the choice will not affect the most diverse spheres of not family, but social life. And since the monarch is a very special person, his marital and family affairs always have a huge public resonance and great significance, including for history.

Peter was categorically against Alexei's marriage to an artistic peasant woman, but he himself married a woman of the same low birth and much lower merit. On a woman who did not remain faithful to him, did not love him, did not protect the interests of his dynasty and, very possibly, poisoned him, as some historians believe.

It is worth considering carefully the myth of Catherine, and

a beautiful tale of high love rarely turns around

310

gross filth. The heroine of this story turns out to be directly guilty of the most mediocre waste of the opportunities that opened up to her, of the lowest behavior and completely unworthy of the position to which she was exalted.

There is a legend that once Peter kissed one of the Dolgoruky for the words: they say, everything in the state cannot be done against the will of the king, by smart or stupid ministers. A stupid sovereign cannot have smart ministers, and vice versa! What is the sovereign, such are his associates; after all, the sovereign draws people closer to himself according to himself ...

It is difficult for us to kiss Dolgorukov, who died three hundred years ago, but we can agree with his assessment. Indeed, even without knowing anything about either Alexei Mikhailovich or Peter, it is quite possible to judge each of them by what their close associates are like.

Peter, as if on purpose, did everything possible to ensure that literally nothing was left after him. He killed a smart, good son who could have ruled after him; elevated to the throne a woman who was mortally dangerous to himself and completely unsuitable for the role of empress. Finally, as if on purpose, he brought to power people who were completely incapable of standing at the helm of the state.

#### Chapter 3

#### VICTIMS OF THE ANTICHRIST

"They will beat you with whips, and you will love me like a pretty little one!" - No, you're just crazy about this whip ...

From the movie Little Red Riding Hood

Of course, the entire population of Muscovy became the victims of Peter's policy. Of course, the top of society suffered less than the bottom, at least they suffered less physically. After all, by 1710 this taxable population had already decreased by a fifth, and it was not the nobles and wealthy merchants at all, but the townspeople and peasants who fled in droves to become robbers.

But here are two curious cases - so, as vivid examples.

In 1712 Field Marshal Boris Petrovich Shere-

Metev is 60 years old. It was already hard for him to lead the troops, and he asked Peter for permission - to retire, to be tonsured as a monk of the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra.

Peter forbade becoming a monk, and ordered the widowed field marshal to marry instead. He even found a wife for him: the widow of his uncle, Lev Kirillovich Naryshkina. Anna Petrovna was 34 years younger than her husband, but the marriage was successful, Anna Petrovna managed to give birth to 5 children before her husband's death.

This is what the tsar did with his entourage, who patriarchally called him "you" and did not at all oppose the "reforms": in 1697, Sheremetev voluntarily

312

shaved off his beard, put on a European dress - even before the decrees of Peter.

Another case is connected with the founder of the Butakov family. This Russian naval family, each generation of which has served and is currently also serving as naval officers, is led by Olympius (Evlampy) Butakov, who has served since 1688, from the first "pompous" flotilla on Lake Pereyasavl. During the Northern War, Butakov became the captain of the 18th cannon shnyava. Once he got lost in the fog on his coat, was late for 10 days in Kronstadt, and for this he was almost to death. In any case, many years later, Olympius' knees were shaking, and he walked only with a stick.

In these cases, we are talking about major generals; about people personally known to Peter. What can we say about the most ordinary, "ordinary" nobles, or even more so about the "thin" service people, without great wealth and without extensive connections at court?!

Many people remember Dmitry Ovtsyn, Bering's navigator. And he had a brother, Lavrenty Ovtsyn, and after committing the same "crime" as Butakov - for getting lost in the fog - Lavrenty Ovtsyn, Dmitry's brother, was not beaten half to death, but to DEATH.

Under Peter, the service class became the main object of corruption and the main field of experimentation. Peter wanted to create a new society - there are no words. But the society that he wanted to have can only very conditionally be called European. Yes, outwardly this society is European at its top - in manners, clothes, food, utensils. But outside the nobility and bureaucracy there is not even this external European gloss. And even the way of life of the nobility has nothing to do with the essential features of the European nobility. No separation of society

'This most interesting information is contained in an unpublished

book "The Butakovs", written by Alexander Alexandrovich Grigorov and dedicated to the famous family. The book is stored in the Kostroma regional archive and is not available in Krasnoyarsk. I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Evgeny Vladimirovich Smetanin, who acquainted me with these materials. — A.B.

313

private and private life, no private property, no rule of law over the arbitrariness of individuals or groups!

Peter believed that the whole way of life of the nobles should be determined by only one factor - serving the state. At first, he acted only by reviews: he called the nobles in order to personally determine their merits and send them to one service or another. All nobles were strictly ordered to submit to the Discharge Order, later to the Senate, lists of minors over 10 years old - both children and adopted children. Teenage orphans, who had no one to enter into the lists, were ordered to appear and sign up themselves. In 1704, for the first time in Moscow, 8,000 undergrowths who had reached the service age of 15 years were gathered for the first time. All of them were personally examined and assigned to the service by the tsar, distributing them into regiments and schools.

Among these 8,000 were about 500 undergrowths from the most noble families of Muscovy. Most of them were painted on the guards regiments.

In 1712, it was ordered to appear to all the minors who studied at home or in schools, and all of them were also distributed personally by the tsar into three ages. The younger ones returned to schools, the middle age was sent abroad to study, and the older ones went into the soldiers.

"Absence", that is, non-appearances, were considered by Peter as treason and were punished more and more cruelly. —

In the autumn of 1714, all nobles from 10 to 30 years old were ordered to appear in the coming winter for registration at the Senate. Anyone who denounces a non-appearance, even if it be his own servant, gets all his belongings and villages.

January 11, 1722 - an even more terrible decree: anyone who did not appear at the review was subjected to "defamation" - to the beat of a drum, the executioner nailed a paper with his name to the gallows, declaring the violator of the decree outside the law; now everyone had the right to beat, rob, kill this man. Whoever catches and brings such a "netchik" receives

314

half of his movable and immovable property, even



if his serf catches the "netchik".

The nobles fought the government with all sorts of subterfuges and evasions. Most often they attached themselves to some idle commissary or police business and, under its cover, experienced wartime in their estates. The abundance of police services, hordes of all kinds of officials and agents, the general confusion made this task very easy for them.

According to Pososhkov, there are many such fine fellows that he could drive five enemies alone, and he, having achieved a bait business, lives for himself and profits.

Absenteeism became another way. "Some nobles have already grown old, live in the villages, but have never been in the service with one foot." "The rich shirk from service, while the old and the poor serve."

Especially funny Pososhkov describes a certain nobleman Zolotarev, who "at home is scary to neighbors, like a lion, but in the service he is worse than a goat." And no one could take him into service: "whoever he pleases with gifts, but he can't, he will pretend to be sick, or he will let foolishness on himself and climb into the lake up to his beard."

When one day Zolotarev failed to shirk the campaign, he sent instead of himself a noble nobleman under his own name, giving him a horse and his man. And he himself went to neighbors, ruined their houses, like a robber.

From the age of 15, an officer had to serve as a private in a regiment. More noble, richer - in the guards, more victorious - in the army. Sooner or later he was to be promoted to officer, but only after several years of service. The law of February 26, 1714 categorically forbids the promotion of officers to people of "noble breeds" who have not served as privates and "from the foundation of soldiering are not

know."

The military charter of 1716 speaks even more clearly: "The Russian nobility has no other way to become officers, except to serve in the Guards of the FII."

315

By the end of Peter's reign, there were three of them - in addition to Semenovskiy and Preobrazhenskiy, since 1719, the dragoon "life regiment", the Horse Guards Regiment.

A nobleman-guardian lived in exactly the same way as a private from commoners, in the same barracks, received exactly the same rations and uniforms and did all the work of a private.

Derzhavin in his notes described how he, the son

nobleman and colonel, entered as a private in the Transfiguration Women's Regiment and lived in the barracks together with privates from the common people, went to work together with them, drove provisions, cleaned channels and ran on parcels from officers.

In 1724, there were more than 30 privates from princely families in the Horse Guards Regiment.

At the same time, military service was considered much more important than civil service, and the King of Arms under the Senate made sure that no more than one third of each noble family served in the civil service.

Until the end of the Northern War, the nobles were not released at all from the regiments. With the advent of peace, they began to let go every two years for six months, on a vacation.

The retired were appointed to garrisons or to civil affairs by local government. Only complete decrepitude or severe injuries served as a reason for resignation. If a retiree did not have an estate, he was sent to a monastery to live from the monastery income or was given a pension from "hospital money".

The combination of words: "serf nobility" sounds somehow wild. Everyone is used to the "serf peasantry", and this even sounds strange somehow ... But one has to recognize this, at first glance, wild thought: before the Manifesto on the Liberty of the Nobility (1762), the nobility was less free than the taxable estates. The notion of the "privileges" of the nobility is so firmly adopted by society that it will be difficult for many to realize: there were periods in history when the position of the nobles was much more difficult, much less free than the peasantry, and even more so.

316

less free than the position of merchants, urban philistines or Cossacks.

The combination of the words "serf nobility" is likely to make the reader smile. But the nobility was really enserfed, there was nothing to be done. Service people have always been in the state in a real "fortress", no less than the peasantry was "in the fortress" of the same state or private landowners.

There are cases when the peasants themselves explained to the fiscals that officials should not be blamed for bribes: they voluntarily brought what they could to the poor. And then they, the servicemen, would have completely died of hunger.

The nobles owned estates - but under Peter and immediately after Peter, the nobles could not live in them. As a rule, they were not even born on their estates and sometimes

saw them all their lives, except that they came to die in them.

For the possession of these estates, for state salaries, the nobles paid a very high price - lifelong service in the most severe conditions. After the introduction of educational conscription, not even a fifteen-year-old boy, but a ten-year-old kid left his parental home, and most often forever ... It was the noble children who were flogged with whips and sticks at the Navigation School, it was the noble undergrowth who ran away to beg in rags, fearing starvation . It was forbidden for the nobles to take their children from such terrible establishments.

Serving all their lives, from the age of ten, the nobles did not have any social guarantees. Oddly enough, but here again the advantages of "taxable" over "servants". A taxable person, as a rule, had very little contact with the authorities. A member of a community, corporation, "community", he dealt primarily with those like him, or with elected elders. These communities did not live according to written laws, but according to traditions: according to rules that were sometimes not even very well understood, but which no one ever violated.

317

Living according to traditions, a person does not make a personal choice, does not enter into controversy. He does it in the only possible way. The one that centuries ago was invented by wise ancestors, without bothering their own mind. Tradition is not democratic; she immediately arranges everyone by rank, by rank, by place, determines who is more important and how much. But tradition guarantees a person something that is far from always able to provide him with the Russian state, "thrown on its hind legs", as if mixed with a mixer. As long as a person fulfills the rules established "from the ages", he knows for sure: nothing threatens him.

Tradition may require you to humiliate yourself, bow down, literally prostrate yourself. But while you are doing it, you cannot be humiliated or offended. Tradition demands unconditional obedience to those whom it considers the highest, demands that one's own interests be subordinated to the interests of the "community". But as long as you fulfill its requirements, your interests will be observed both by the higher world of this world and by society. By tradition, you will always be given what you are supposed to, and if you are still offended, there will always be those who will stand up for you. They can't help joining! Because if the superiors do not follow the traditions, they will question their position in society, their position as "SUPERIOR".

In Europe, the slowly receding tradition was replaced by laws just as slowly. In the Russian Empire, laws remained somewhat conventional and

always served the rich and powerful. Living in a world where there are neither laws nor traditions, the Russian nobleman turned out to be defenseless against arbitrariness. The arbitrariness of the superiors became the everyday rule, the norm of life for the nobility. After all, the omnipotence of the state, of course, is some kind of abstraction, because in practice very specific persons are omnipotent - government officials and representatives of the state.

Even if a person ascended so high that the rest of the nobles were no longer dangerous, his life,

318

property and position in society depended on the arbitrariness of one person - the king. The tsar, having destroyed both religious and social traditions, was bound by absolutely nothing. And in exactly the same way, its officials were practically not bound by anything, in whose will (or tyranny) lay the "will of the state" for the absolute majority of subjects.

I repeat with good reason: the worst of all in all the turmoil of Peter the Great was the service class, the nobility. The servicemen not only bore the brunt of his reforms, but also found themselves in the most indefinite, most "mean" position.

The destruction of traditional culture for the service class also meant the destruction of the value system, everything that scientists call almost poetically: "the field of meaning of words." As a result, for almost the entire XVIIIth century, the nobleman literally did not know what was generally right and what was wrong, what was fair and what was not, where to sail and which shores to hold on to.

The nobleman was a civil servant not just "by position". The very essence of the service class, the nobility, was to serve the Russian state. Service in Russia gave both social status, and a place in life, and material well-being ... in a word, absolutely everything!

He could not disrespect his Faith, Tsar and Fatherland, because it was for them that he went into battle, he realized himself as their servant. This idea of Service became the cornerstone of morality, and a person was judged as "good" OR "BAD", as "best" or "worst" according to how

well and how faithfully he served.

He simply organically could not not perceive Russia as a fertile country, as a kind of bright essence. It is impossible either to go to the screeching buckshot, or to climb the fortress walls for something bad or unworthy!

But Rus', for which the nobleman shed blood, was officially declared a country stupid, wild, stupid and

yearning for rigorous correction. Moreover, announcing

319

It was controlled by its own government, the same one that ordered the "serviceman" to cross the border and "engage in battle" with the enemy.

And with this "brain twist" that stretched over several generations, the nobles, with the exception of purchased slaves or women in Muslim harems, turned out to be the most disenfranchised people in the entire Russian Empire. At least, the most disenfranchised class.

Under Peter and immediately after him, there were absolutely no guarantees of personal security for anyone.

It is easy to fill many pages with descriptions of the wildest violence, lawlessness and violations of property rights, personal integrity and other elementary human rights.

In 1724, once again feeling unwell, Peter decided that syphilis had been "given" to him by his last mistress, the wife of his officer, Praskovya ... And he ordered his husband to flog the "unfit Froska" for giving the tsar- father.

In a society where a court lady can be roughly groped at any moment, sorry, in any place, forced into cohabitation or whipped with batogs (and soldiers will carry out the sentence at the palace porch), there are no and cannot be guarantees of personal security in principle to one person.

Chapter 4

FROM SIDE TO SIDE

- With one foot we stand in the past, with the other foot - in communism!

"How long are we going to stand like this?"

Anecdote from the 1960s

DEAD END

On January 28, 1725, the tsar died, who both in the Russian Empire and in the USSR was supposed to be considered a great statesman, a great reformer, a great commander, a great creator of a new, great

Russia. And his corpse did not have time to cool down, as the newly minted state, proclaimed only in 1721, the Russian Empire finds itself in a complete dead end. Perhaps the clearest confirmation of this is the dynastic impasse. It is completely incomprehensible whom to enthrone after the death of the "great reformer"!

According to Peter's decree "On the succession to the throne" of February 5, 1722, the emperor of the Russian Empire himself had to appoint his heir and successor. It seems to be before the death of Peter | tried to exercise this right. Even today you can see the slate. board, on which the hand of the first Russian emperor inscribed la "Give everything ..." and an oblique stroke from top to bottom - Peter did not hold a piece of slate in his hands, could not inscribe the name of his successor.

321

According to N.I. Kostomarov (actually always very accurate and objective in his assessments), represented by Peter | the monarch was dying, who "as a historical figure was a peculiar phenomenon not only in Russian history, but also in the history of mankind".

"In terrible physical suffering, with full recognition of human weakness, with a demand for reinforcement from above, religious reinforcement, the greatest of historical figures died," S.M. With catches?.

The almost modern writer N. Dubov also speaks of the death of Peter as a high tragedy: "The giant collapsed, and the hand that, playfully, waved an ax, a blacksmith's sledgehammer, held the ship's steering wheel, turned the cannons, could not hold the stylus. "Give me everything..." she scribbled with the last effort and missed the stylus.

This is the usual style of statements that have been heard for the third century. It has become a kind of intellectual tradition to guess - who could Peter name, whose name he wanted to enter, but did not have time ?!

N.M. Kostomarov even thinks that Peter could bring up the grandson of Peter Alekseevich as a son and thus get out of the dynastic impasse. For this, they say, the Decree on the succession to the throne was needed - so that when "appointing" an heir, it would be possible to "jump" through a whole generation in the dynasty.

Dissonance in this chorus sounds like a statement not by a historian, not by a philosopher, but by a writer, A.A. Bushkova: "The sad result is that Peter himself could not fail to understand: there is no one to leave the inheritance to! Ekateri's wife is stupid, dissolute and frankly becomes an inveterate drunkard. Elizabeth is only sixteen. Grandson Peter Alekseevich is ten. Young nieces Annai Ekaterina is married to a foreign

strange princelings ... Praskovya's niece with her mind

1 Kostomarov N.M. Russian history in the biographies of its main figures. M., 1992. S. 780.

2 Soloviev S.M. History of Russia since ancient times. Book [H. M., 1963. S. 541.

3 Dubov N.N. Wheel of Fortune. M., 1981. S. 134. 322

doesn't shine. NO HEIR. No matter who's name you write, he or she will inevitably become a toy in the hands of those close to you - embezzlers of public funds, spendthrifts, preoccupied only with their own success... Peter could not help but understand this. He knew very well. Therefore, there is no mystery. The Will, one can vouch for it, remained unfinished not because a minute was not enough for a cold hand. Peter, no doubt trying to predict the course of events after his death, simply realized that it was useless to name anyone. Because there will be no successor."

The opinion of A. Bushkov, although indirectly, is confirmed by such a powerful researcher of the era as V.V. Mavrodin: "But he was sick, and not only in body, but also in soul. I felt immeasurably tired. All one and one. Watch everything, think about everything, check everyone, and if you don't check - and your best friend will turn out to be an embezzler, a swashbuckler, a selfish person. Peter lowered his hands more and more often, became lethargic, thoughtful. Those around him saw in the eyes of the king fatigue and indifference to everything, so alien to him before, and sometimes longing. Peter was dissatisfied with everything he had done, he felt his own powerlessness and inability to complete the implementation of his vast plans.

In essence, A.A. Bushkov and V.V. Mavrodin said almost the same thing, albeit in different words: in recent months, perhaps even years, Peter felt the meaninglessness, the hopelessness of what he had done in his not very long life. Tired, boring, "excessively tired" was a man of only 52-53 years old. The age, of course, is not youthful, but not only today, and in those days too - it is by no means the age of decrepitude and approaching death.

"Learn from me what a poor animal man is," used to say the unrecognizable Peter.

Fall into mortal anguish, lose the taste for life and, in essence, passively wait for death at this age,

'Bushkov A.A. Russia, which was not. M., 1997. S. 425.

2 Mavrodin V.V. The birth of a new Russia. L., 1988. S. 189.

323

besides mental illness, only complete disappointment in what he has been doing all his life, disbelief that this business can be continued can make a person. However, dying after everything that Peter has done is probably unbearably scary - especially if you believe in the Supreme Court and that you will have to answer for everything. And he certainly believed.

He was also physically ill. Overstrain, wild excesses, untreated diseases crippled the body. Syphilis was also suspected.

And the dynastic affairs of the newly-made Russian Empire after the death of its first emperor, Peter, you look much sadder. According to all laws, the eldest son inherits the throne ... But Tsarevich Alexei was executed as a traitor, and there is no other heir.

I will allow myself to express a judgment, perhaps extremely out of date and, in any case, contradicting the materialistic interpretation of events. But there are moments in history when the Providence of God in history and in the relations of people declares itself so loudly that it is simply impossible not to hear it. After all, when the sons of Peter from Marta Skavronskaya die one after another, it turns out that the cannibal king, who ate his own son, still cannot create a dynasty on the bones of his eldest child. Given to you the eldest son, from the first wife, who is from God?! Dan. And if you are not able to dispose of what is given, then do not imagine that you can continue your dynasty in the way you have imagined, and even more so corrected by the gift.

Initially, Tsar Peter was given the opportunity to continue the Romanov dynasty with his successful, fully valuable son. And moreover, he was given a kind, talented, intelligent son. The king began to remake life according to his own mind, committing many crimes at the same time... The eldest son, God-given heir, was destroyed. Whether from the highest state considerations, or to clear the way for the children from the second and beloved wife. It turns out that together with the eldest, who turned out to be the only son, Peter ruined the fate of both the family and the dynasty!

324

... But the reader, of course, has the right to consider all this clerical nonsense of mine as the costs of education or simply stupidity. As you wish! Only now the facts cry out: the sons from Skavronskaya did not live. Alexey was



the only son of Peter, who lived to adulthood. Peter killed him, and after that all the other sons died.  
new...

So, there is no son, direct heir.

No matter how vaguely stated the Charter of February 5, 1722, it clearly states about inheritance by law - if there is no son, then the eldest daughter inherits. But the eldest daughter of Peter, Anna, at the betrothal to the Duke of Holstein in 1724, under oath, renounced the Russian throne together with her fiancé for herself and for her offspring. The refusal is also noted in their prenuptial agreement, everything is stipulated here with the utmost clarity.

This means that the legal inheritance passed to the second daughter of Peter, Elizabeth.

Under no circumstances could Peter's widow, Catherine, become empress, and not at all because of her low birth. Both according to the ancient Russian law of inheritance and according to the decree of 1714, a widow-mother with minor children is provided for and can remain a guardian until they come of age. But she doesn't have to be the heiress.

The old well-born nobility, faithful to the old custom of succession to the throne, wanted to see Peter Alekseevich, the grandson of Peter, the son of the executed Tsarevich Alexei, on the throne.

The nominees of the time of Peter the Great - Tolstoy, Menshikov, Yaguzhinsky, Shafirov ... however, it would be a long list, were horrified at the prospect of Peter's accession. Pyotr Alekseevich was already a very frank banner of a return to the old - to everything that was before Peter. The newly-born princes really did not want to go back to the dirt, and they had a reliable means of putting on the throne not the one who has the right, but who is more needed by this

gangs.

325

#### CONTINUERS OF "PETER'S CASE"

On the night of January 28, a few hours before the death of the emperor, it was these high dignitaries who gathered in the palace to discuss a successor, they were already beginning to lean towards the proclamation of the young Peter Alekseevich as emperor. After all, the direct heir of the Romanovs in the direct male line.

Those gathered, for all the enormity of their power, are terribly unsure of themselves. More than once they ask the secretary of state A.V. Makarova - are there any orders of the emperor, still unknown?! And they are not. Peter though about-

proclaimed almost by a god, from the coffin does not suggest anything, and the "dealers" simply do not know what to do.

Supporters of the Grand Duke Peter Alekseevich even offered a deal - let's elevate him to the throne, and let Catherine and the Senate rule until Peter comes of age ...

In the room where a super-important state matter is decided, the fate of the entire vast Russian Empire is being decided, in a strange way guards officers were present ... What were they doing here, in the hall where the highest dignitaries decided such important issues?! An idle question, if the guards were talking loudly among themselves, defiantly not noticing the others, and the theme was the same: they, the guards, would immediately break the boyars' heads if the boyars did not swear allegiance to the "mother sovereign", Empress Catherine ...

And so it went on, until outside the windows there was a drumbeat from the square, the sounds of commands. "It turned out that both guards regiments entered the square, lined up in a square. There is evidence that cannons were even rolled out, standing near them with lit fuses. However, at the expense of guns, perhaps an exaggeration, not everyone confirms this detail.

Prince Repnin, President of the Military Collegium, angrily asked:

"Who dared to bring regiments here without my knowledge?! Am I not a field marshal?!"

326

To which Ivan Buturlin, the commander of the Semyonovsky regiment, replied that he called the regiments on the orders of the empress, to whom everyone must obey ... "Not excluding you," Buturlin pointed his finger at Repnin.

When the regiments appeared, the guards, who were sticking out in the hall, took out their swords from the scabbards, and Menshikov also took out his sword, defiantly rubbed the blade with the cuff of his uniform and declared that if someone is against mother queen, then let him speak out, all this will be very interesting to the ambassador sew.

Catherine was proclaimed empress not because she was elected by the Zemsky Sobor; there was not even a fiction of 1682, when a crowd of random people shouted: "We want Peter!" Catherine | enthroned the guards, hiding behind the interpretation of the will of the deceased Peter. Like, since he crowned her in 1724, it means that he wanted to see her as an empress after himself.

What kind of a monarch she was, this EPISODE perfectly shows: "... early in the morning Petersburg was awakened

a terrible alarm: it was the inconsolable widow empress who joked about the capital - for the sake of April 1.

And less than a year later, a new analogue of the Boyar Duma arose - the Supreme Privy Council. It arose not because it contained something necessary for the country, but as a result of intrigues: a handful of Peter's top associates wanted to maintain their power at any cost. The Senate is an assembly of senior officials, and they created an assembly already completely mafia-based on the principle of personal acquaintance and personal agreements with each other. Why is the Council secret? Because no one needs to know what matters are being discussed at it!

On February 8, 1726, the Supreme Privy Council was created, consisting of A.D. Menshikov, F.M. Apraksina, G.I. Golovina, A.I. Osterman, P.A. Tolstoy, D.M. Golitsyn and Duke Karl Holstein. Karl got into this high company exclusively as the husband of Peter's eldest daughter, Anna Petrovna.

1 Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 3. Rostov-on-Don, 2000. S. 199.

327

By the same decree, the Senate lost the title "governing" and began to be called simply "high." At the departure of the Empress, the Supreme Privy Council was now to rule...

Sad is the fate of these first "supreme leaders" - members of the Supreme Privy Council, created by Catherine I in 1726. Initially, out of 7 "Verkhovnikovs", 5 were you promoters of the time of Peter the Great – after all, they conceived this authority as a kind of Boyar Duma for "THE OWN". But very unstable, indefinite people were these same "nominees"! Even as intriguers, they lost out to the descendants of ancient families: after all, even intriguers need to trust at least someone and be able to act as a close-knit group. And the "dealers" nurtured by Peter, the "chicks of Petrov's nest" simply pathologically did not know how to do this, and all the time they grappled with the feudal clans of the Dolgoruky and Golitsyns, and with each other. They betrayed each other with such zeal that very quickly the ratio in the Supreme Privy Council changed in favor of the old families, Dolgoruky and Golitsyn (including because members of the feudal families knew how to hold on to each other).

And of the first seven members, only Golovin and Osterman remained in the composition of the Supreme Privy Council after all the changes until 1730.

Only four years were allotted to the Supreme Privy Council, but "on the other hand" what four years! The time is right

leniya of two emperors - Catherine [and Peter !!

I note that the hereditary aristocracy, the representatives of the ancient families, are still far from being in power; They are only just returning, and it is very characteristic that in the ranks of these returnees we see precisely the Golitsyns and Dolgorukis, and not the fabulously incompetent Buynosovs. The aristocracy of Rus' in the 18th century, intimidated by the "lowest gentry", lackeys and slanderers of Peter, is gradually raising its head and adapting to the new state of affairs ... At least, that part of it that is able to adapt. So far, those "standing in a greedy crowd at the throne" are still nominees of Peter 1.

328

Both his wife and his closest "companions" are direct offspring of the Antichrist, they are those whom he pulled out of oblivion, dragged into history and who, if not for Peter, would never have been known or rich.

And the family, relatives of the Antichrist, his heirs find themselves at the mercy of all this bastard...!, which he himself carefully selected and on which, due to the natural course of events, he began to depend.

It is difficult to say how the fate of the empire would have turned if the Lord had let Catherine go | or Peter P at least 30 or 40 years of life. Each of these options is the addition of a completely new, completely special situation in the history of the Russian state. The long reign of Catherine is the probability of one path, the long reign of Peter | is a completely different possibility.

But Catherine was not even 50 years old, and Peter II was not even 20. The fact remains that after Peter the emperors somehow did not live. It may very well be that they were simply helped to die, and, moreover, those closest to the throne, the most trusted persons - such an explanation of the issue is not at all excluded. |

In our rational age, it is strange, even somehow indecent, to recall that for four generations there has been a curse on the descendants of scoundrels and criminals. You even thought of a POST suitable for an irresponsible age - THEY SAY, "the son is not responsible for the father." An interesting question! If a father or grandfather are worthy and glorious people, then, then, accept the inheritance with a clear conscience, warm yourself by the fire that was not kindled by you! Enjoy it, heir!

And if your ancestor is a murderer and a bastard, then, then, you can also act quite comfortably and conveniently BUT - "but I'm not responsible for him!" And it even becomes

1 In those days, the word bastard was used not quite the way it is now. This was the name given to those who were dragged off, "dragged" to the construction of canals or to factories. In official documents, it was written like this - "I am sending to the plant two hundred people of every bastard who I managed to rake in." I use the word not in a pejorative, but in a historical sense. — A.B.

329

it is possible not only not to bear ecclesiastical and civil repentance, not to try to correct what has been done, but it is also possible to use the stolen, looted. It's a matter of life, but the son is not responsible for his father!

If the heirs of Peter the "Great" were not poisoned by anyone from their own closest and courtiers, one thing remains - after all, they "answered"! They answered with their lives, their fate for the crimes of their ancestor, and they had nowhere to run from this, from the Supreme Court.

## KINGDOM OF WILD LAWLESS

Calling a spade a spade, after Peter the reign of absolutely wild lawlessness set in in the Russian Empire. Most often they nod at the "law on the succession to the throne" - they say, the whole point is that there was no strict, unambiguous law, according to which a new emperor was to be enthroned. Undoubtedly, this is one of the reasons for the reigning anarchy; using the law on the succession to the throne, it was just possible to put one or the other on the throne, or even to make up a "testament", lining up future emperors.

But the main reason for lawlessness is that only the will of Peter cemented the layer of his close associates. So Peter died, and it turned out that even his highest dignitaries were not ministers at all, "as in Europe," all the more so, no convinced associates and successors. These are only the most trusted, but by no means the most devoted servants, completely devoid of their own will, initiative, and even more so, of the statesman's mind. Servants who, in the absence of the master, simply rob his estate - in this case, the Russian state.

The company, which Peter himself nurtured and nurtured, finished off the state, did not allow to return even to the semblance of legality. Any government decisions were taken solely in the interests of a handful of selfish and primitive people.

Even the most loyal to the Romanov dynasty, the most faithful historians of the 18th and 20th centuries agree with this, albeit very streamlined. Not only

N.M. Karamzin, but also O. Yeger, whose book was published in 1894.

Modern historians, who are not bound by loyalty to the dynasty, by the obligation to bypass many topics, have absolutely "impermissible" assumptions. You are affected by the assumption that Peter | he could well have been poisoned - too serious a danger hung over the "most serene prince", whose theft Peter finally started to stop. Among the possible performers who personally poured poison into the emperor's drink, Catherine is also called.

It is very possible that Ekaterina herself was next - she died very unexpectedly quickly, somehow very "on time". So that involuntarily comes to mind the classic "the Moor has done his job ...". And ends in the water - also a classic way to "clean up" the perpetrator of a political assassination.

Then A.D. himself will become victims of intrigues in the highest echelons of power. Menshikov, who died in 1729 in Berezovo, and Tolstoy, who ended his days in 1730 in a stone sack in the Solovetsky prison. A year before him, Tolstoy's only son, Ivan, also died in a nearby dungeon.

"Never before in our country, yes, it seems, and in no other state, did the supreme power pass along such a broken line ... they all got to the throne not according to any order established by law or custom, but by chance, through a palace coup or court intrigue," states V.O. Klyuchevsky.

But even Vladimir Osipovich did not hesitate in the least - all these dubious heirs of the Antichrist Tsar continued what Peter had begun. For him, and for practically all other historians of Russia, it was obvious that two groups of people were colliding here: the old conservative nobility, who did not want the "reforms of Peter the Great", and the innovators, followers of Peter, people from the masses of the people.

Thanks to these nominees of Peter, "... it became obvious that it would not be possible to destroy what Peter had begun. Not because all recent comrades-in-arms were eager to continue it.

1 Yeger O. World history in 4 vols. T 3. St. Petersburg, 1894. 331

business... They could only survive by retaining power, and they could only keep it by clinging to Petrovo's cause and continuing it. They continued. Stupidly, wildly and out of order, but they continued.

The only question is what is meant by the "case" of Peter [? If the plundering and the collapse of everything that is possible, then the successors did this "deed" in good faith.

Only by the middle of the 17th century, 3-4 decades after Peter, did at least some kind of stability begin to emerge. Under Catherine, who was also an illegal ruler through and through, the new "rules of the game" finally took shape... This "golden age" of "mother Catherine" is still considered by many to be one of the highest rises in Russia.

But stabilization had to go long, painfully, choosing and groping for the road. In the middle of the 15th century, the Russian Empire entered as an absolutely amazing state, in which no less than three crowned emperors were in good health at the same time. In this era, all the new legitimate heirs to the throne of Russia marched in columns, they were found even in Italy and France, while others were sitting in fortresses at that time.

The "golden age" of Catherine, 1760-1790, began with the extermination of this crowd of "superfluous emperors". Not a legal war against lawlessness, directly generated by Peter.

So many secret deeds and moves were being made that even the government itself hardly understood where truth ends and fiction begins - even in government official documents. Moreover, ordinary inhabitants of the empire did not know who rules them and on what basis. In the "golden age" of Catherine, there were more lies in politics, both external and internal, than under Brezhnev, and the government crushed and trampled on the last glimpses of people's freedom ...

And for whom was this "golden age"? Not at all for the 35 million subjects of the Russian empire. It was a "golden age" for a handful of nobles and officials,

1 Dubov N.N. Wheel of Fortune. M., 1981. S. 143. 332

for 2% of the total population of the country. He became "golden" because this bunch was monstrously corrupted by fantastic privileges that are not confirmed by any real service.

In the "golden age" many amazing stories circulated around Russia, and perhaps the most amazing of them is the story of the Manifesto about the liberty of the peasants ...

But this amazing story deserves a separate book!

The book I will write soon... After this one.

Chapter 5

HISTORICAL VIRTUALITY

The saddest words in the world: "and all this could be...

French proverb

RUSSIA WITHOUT PETER

The paradox is that it is much easier to imagine a Russia in which there is no Peter or in which he does not reign than the one that took place. If we are talking about historical accidents, then it is difficult to imagine something more accidental than the accession of Peter. Strictly speaking, the birth of Peter was already accidental... Why, in fact, did Natalya Kirillovna have to give birth to a boy? And if Natalya Naryshkina gave birth to only a few girls? Or here's another version: what if she gives birth in due time to a perfectly decent, healthy boy who looks ridiculously like Aleksey Mikhailovich ...

But these are all options when Peter is not there or when he is born and grows up as a not lanky strange creature that raises questions about who his real father is.

But even if Peter exists, if he is the way he was born, his very coming to power is an unpredictable accident, a consequence of the early death of several people, primarily his father and elder

brother.  
334

The simplest option, in which Peter will not be close to the throne, is that Alexei Mikhailovich lives ... well, let's say, until 1696, until his 67 years. Or until 1700, that is, until 71. In principle, he could well live up to such a period; and in the 17th century there were many people who died under seventy or even over seventy. His father also lived very little, only 49 years old, but his grandfather, Patriarch Filaret, lived to be 78 years old; were among the Romanovs and other "long inhabitants". Their life spans seem modest by modern standards, but still many have crossed the border of the eighth decade. Why shouldn't Alexei Mikhailovich be one of them?!

The second option - does not die (having managed, for example, to avoid poisoning by his stepmother) Fedor Alekseevich. He lives ... well, even if it is short-lived, he will live the same 46 years as his father. But even then he, Fyodor Alekseevich, would live until 1707.



If we imagine Muscovy, in which both of them, father and son, and even any of them will live such terms, Peter will not see power as his own ears.

Especially if Fedor has heirs, and this is more than likely. After all, it seems that he was poisoned hastily, so that no one would have time to be born from the second queen ...

And even if Peter already exists, he is already growing, even when both Alexei Mikhailovich and Fedor Alekseevich are already dead, there are varmants.

It was worth Sophia to act more decisively ... Namely, Sophia, because Vasily Vasilyevich Golitsyn, apparently, was organically incapable of "undercover" struggle, of sending assassins or dripping a cherished drop into a cherished glass from a secretly twisted ring. And you don't need much: a few determined people who have settled in a grove on the road; where Peter, alone or with the faithful Aleksashka, rushes to Kukuy - either to Anna Mons, or to Lefort.

So, a variant of virtuality: in 1687, Peter and Aleksashka disappear; their bodies are found two days later,

335

stuffed into a stack. Or they find it six months later, in the depths of the forest, already gnawed by foxes.

Tsar Ivan sits on his throne, but in reality it is not he who rules, but Sophia and Golitsyn. In this version, it is not even very important whether Golitsyn takes the veil of his wife as a nun and marries Sophia or not. The dynasty, strictly speaking, is destined to change anyway because Ivan has no sons, only daughters. No matter how long he lives, either one of the "Ivanovnas" (with or without a husband) or close relatives (that is, again, Sophia ...) should ascend the throne after him.

Speaking frankly, the prospect of Vasily Golitsyn on the throne somehow pleases me more than Ivan picking his nose, and this is not only a matter of aesthetic taste. After all, not only Peter could play the role of the destroyer of the country, there are no words. After all, his niece Anna Ivanovna was no worse than Peter, destroying everything she could reach.

So it is not a matter of good looks, and not even of the everyday habits of the individuals occupying the throne. Rather, the goal is to ensure that there is no person on the throne who is capable of leading the country off the already chosen path. And for this, at the end of the XVIIIth century, in addition to Alexei Mikhailovich and Fyodor Alekseevich, only Sofya and Golitsyn are suitable ...

Let's simulate two possible options: in the first of them, after the death of Ivan in 1697, one of the "Ivanovna" rises to the throne, but in fact Sophia still rules. |

In the second, after the death of Ivanovna's father, they do not sit on the throne - for example, if they marry for some time (not necessarily foreign princes). Then the "supreme ruler" is crowned the kingdom as a queen. And if Golitsyn comes to the conclusion that Moscow is worth a divorce, a change of dynasty is inevitable.

And of course, Sophia the ruler, Sophia - my beloved wife could live much longer than she stretched out in the stone cell of the monastery (until 1704).

336

In all these variants, the political line that the Romanovs began back in the 1620s continues. What could Russia become if this line were consistently continued?

## DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT

First, it is, of course, the completion of Russian modernization. Not the external Europeanization of the nobility while maintaining the slavery of all the rest, but the consistent improvement of administration, the expansion of the zone of freedom for the entire people. The servants, of course, finally become an ordinary European army, the most ordinary European bureaucracy (as in Sweden or Germany). Ministries may well continue to be called orders, and some types of troops - archers: it doesn't change anything.

In the same way, the country remains, most likely, divided into appanages, or, say, voivodeships also appear (as in modern Poland). But the management of appanages and voivodeships is increasingly being transferred "to the localities", the most normal decentralization of management is underway.

The same goes for the name of the country. It is unlikely that Sophia would want to call the country an "empire". Muscovy, Tataria, Tartaria ... Yes, this has already become obsolete. Moreover, the annexation of Little Russia, claims to Galicia forced to talk about the country ruled by the Romanovs, as about all of Russia ... Well, they would have called the country Russia, without ambitions to become a new Rome and without frightening neighbors.

Most likely, the Europeanization of the service class

would have happened even faster than in our reality, under Peter and after Peter. It may very well have kept

The custom of separate participation of men and women at feasts, of going to visit not in pairs, but spouses separately, men to men, women to women, would have been preserved forever, or at least for a long time. So what?

337

In modern India, even if married couples come and gather, still men and women form different, almost non-mixing groups. This "for some reason" does not prevent Hindu physicists from receiving Nobel Prizes, and Hindu entrepreneurs from flooding the world with fabrics, utensils and metal products.

In the same way, in Russia, their own, local customs could well be preserved; those very "good morals" about those mornings that Prince Shcherbatov mourned. After all, no one and nothing was hindered by all the nice folk customs, swept away by a wave of superficial, purely external Europeanization. Russia could well modernize, become a more industrial and more bourgeois country, preserving them in full or almost in full.

It is very possible that family clans would stop deciding the fate of their young members even earlier than in our reality. Not at the end, but in the middle of the 17th century, with the full preservation of all folk customs and traditions.

After Peter, 90% of the modernization went on among the nobility, and the rest of the people were only the foot of this elite process. All the features in essence, and not in form, that brought the people's environment closer to the European world, were destroyed by Peter and Peter's successors.

In Sophia's Russia, in the north, the free peasantry is increasingly becoming a stratum of free burghers, modeled not even in Germany, but in the countries of Scandinavia. They wear beards, blouses and sundresses (just like the Scots wear men's kilts), but this does not in the least prevent them from being free citizens, freely owning property and building their own lives according to their own concepts and traditions. And the European path of development is precisely this, after all.

Even more bourgeois traditions are taking shape on the Volga, where serfdom was weak, and relations of free hiring were the most common thing. Here the feudal way of life goes into the past very easily and quickly, already

338

to the beginning of the eighteenth century. Even in mainland

The cities of Great Russia are increasingly fortifying cities, acquiring not fictitious, on paper, but very real rights. After all, industry and trade develop on the basis of contracts, free employment, and the free movement of capital, goods, and labor power. It is very possible that "kumpans" also arise - again, not fictitious, in the spirit of Peter, but completely real. But it is more likely that capitals will be pooled not anonymously, in the form of joint-stock companies, but by adding up the capitals of family firms (as merchants in Persia, Japan and China did). This form is less mobile than equity capital, less dynamic, no words. Most likely, someday stock exchanges would have been built (as they were built in St. Petersburg at the beginning of the 20th century), but there would have been some period before the stock exchanges, when family-friendly "companyships" would have been more convenient for merchants.

While maintaining the "line of Sophia", Arkhangelsk, Kholmogory, Astrakhan soon become the richest cities and begin to either borrow Magdeburg law in the Commonwealth, or create their own versions of city law.

The state is increasingly withdrawing from the management of economic life, and even the cities of Great Russia are beginning to be managed in a different way. Yes, in these cities there is no town hall, and the elected head is called the "head", and not the mayor. Likewise, the city's elected council is called a soviets or дума rather than a magistrate. But townspeople are more and more reminiscent of European townspeople, because they live in the world of a market economy and because the state practically does not interfere in economic and public life.

Until now, we have been talking about what could have happened if there had not been a pogrom of Petrine, and everything would have gone on as before - in the 1690s, 1700s, just as in the 1670s-1680s ...

But there was also the idea of \u200b\u200bGolitsyn's reform ... It was worth carrying out this reform (for which the army of Fyodor Alekseevich and a significant part of the service class stood),

339

and by the beginning of the 17th century, Russia was to become a country where not a quarter of the population was already non-serving and non-taxable, but the majority of the population.

\_ Society in such a "Golitsyn's Russia" would be organized almost the same as in Prussia or Mecklenburg - that is, in the eastern German lands.

Golitsyn's reform would have been the end of serfdom in Russia. Which means, firstly, a colossal impetus to economic and social development. After all, free peasants will introduce new crops, invent new ways of cultivating the land, create pre-

acceptance for the processing of their products, depart for various industries ...

And secondly, serfdom would never have developed in Russia in those terrible forms that had developed by the time of Catherine I<sup>1</sup>. There will be no drowned newborn babies and greyhound puppies at the breast of a woman, no chained and flogged to death, no line of brides and grooms marching to church. This will not happen either in Russian history or in the psychology of the people.

And if we are already talking about folk psychology - even if not immediately, but a free Russian peasant, a free townsman, protected from arbitrariness both by laws and by his own, albeit relative, but still well-being, will inevitably become not a "serf", but "master". After all, even in France not all were magnates and sovereign princes, but any peasant in the most miserable and downtrodden village was "monsieur", and his wife was "madame".

Golitsyn's reform is also an increase in the self-esteem of a huge mass of people, in fact, of the entire people. This is a different social psychology, a different social climate. |

Of course, there is no schizophrenic division of Russians into "the people" and the nobility, "the people" and the intelligentsia. There is no wild idea of the "people" as natives, no desire to remake and re-educate them. There is no response - rejection in the people

340

de everything that comes from "bar" or is somehow connected with ""bars".

"Sophia's Russia", "Golitsyn's Russia" emerges as an ordinary European country, without any exoticism that places it outside the civilized world. With their own national, religious and cultural characteristics, but completely without any frightening deviations.

However, the list is long, and it is not known whether we all know about it. After all, for too long this Russia of the 17th century was hushed up, telling tales about how the country was pulled out of the darkness by a lanky tsar with a tiny head, smaller than his own fist, and crazy eyes of a maniac. Ideological dogmas have covered reality from us for two centuries, what can you do! But when you see the light, you can't renounce it just because you were blind before?

Conclusion  
OR PORTRAITS ON THE WALL

Russia is Peter and Lenin.

V.N. Sevastyanov

Psychologists very convincingly say that a person, strictly speaking, has no past - it has already been lived, a person has no power over the past. Man has power only over his future; only the future is what he actually has.

I willingly attribute the same to states, countries and peoples. Russians have no past in the sense that it has already taken place. We live in one of the possible Russias, but all these Russias are in the past. That Russia that has come true is Peter, that Russia that has not come true without Peter, in which Aleksey Mikhailovich lives until 1700, and Fedor Alekseevich until 1730. Like the Russia of Sophia and Golitsyn. They are all in the past, and nothing can be changed. Even if Fedor Alekseevich had lived to 1730 and built a completely different Russia, in no way similar to Peter's Russia, then this event would be separated

hundreds of years from us.

Even looking into the past, not wanting to part with it, we are building not the past, but the future. The only question is what events and what people we take with us from this past ...

The intellectual tsar Fyodor Alekseevich and the executioner Romo Danovsky are contemporaries. Portraits were painted from them, and the appearance of these people is known to us. Just like sha

342

Firov, Tsarevich Alexei, Menshikov and Yakov Bruce knew each other well. Contemporaries. Evdokia Lopukhina and Martha-Ekaterina Skavroschuk are the wife of one man, Tsarevich Alexei and Elizabeth are brother and sister by father. They are all our past, whether we like it or not, whether we like them or not.

By hanging a portrait of each of these people on the wall, we do not change the past, but shape the present and the future. Because the portraits of historical figures on the walls are symbols of how we feel about our past, our country, and even ourselves. These are symbols of what aspects of our past we would like to repeat in the future.

It is not for nothing that Peter loved Ivan GU so much, and Stalin loved them both. It is no coincidence that one of the leaders of the Krasnoyarsk communists wrote poems, from which I took a line for an epigraph. For him, Russia completely boils down to Peter and Lenin, and this is almost a diagnosis.

How can one not recall the experiment that was carried out in Israel on the kidnapped Eichmann! The Nazi executioner was given five hundred photographs. He did not know what kind of people were in the photographs, and the task was simple - to divide the photographs into two piles according to one simple principle: like or dislike. I repeat: Eichmann did not know who was depicted in the photographs, but he was not mistaken even once. He liked only recidivist criminals, alcoholics, sex maniacs, lunatics, sadists, swindlers. But they did not like professors, writers, poets, inventors and designers of new machines, liberal politicians, and so on and so forth. In a word, everyone at the sight of whom Hitler and his henchmen grabbed pistols.

Oh, it's no coincidence that we like people, and it's no coincidence that we don't like them, including those who lived a very long time ago.

Yes, there was such a Russia - the Russia of Peter and Lenin. Russia of Marta Skavronskaya and Menshikov, Shafirov and Anna Ivanovna, Lefort and Nikita Zotov. In modern Russia there are many people who like these creatures and who want to build a future similar to

343

to this past. Hanging these portraits on the walls, we call upon our heads this Russia... their Russia.

But at the same time and in parallel, there was the Russia of Princess Sophia, Alexei Mikhailovich, Tsarevich Alexei, Dolgoruky, Vasily Golitsyn and Yakov Bruce ... It would take a long time to list, and why? We know little about this Russia, because it has been hushed up for too long, telling us fairy tales about how "backward" and ignorant all these people were.

Let, of course, the reader decide for himself whose portraits to hang on the wall. What kind of future do we want, such ghosts and call them of the past.

If you want, let the intelligent face of Vasily Golitsyn look at you from the wall, Alexei Mikhailovich's pleasant, significant "parsun", Princess Sophia smiles a little embarrassedly, ironically glances at the sweet face of Tsarevich Alexei.

And if you like it - admire the monstrous mug of Fyodor Yuryevich Romodanovsky, the powdered physiognomy of the personal friend of the devils and the passive faggot Lefort, the degenerative muzzle of Nikita Zotov swollen from drunkenness, the mean mug of Menshikov. Free will. Just don't imagine, for God's sake, that this choice will have no effect on your own future and the future of your children and grandchildren. By choosing the past, we choose the future. |

...Choosing?

List of  
used literature

Tolstoy A.K. Collected works in 4 volumes. T. 1. M., 1963. Karamzin N.M. A note about ancient and new Russia. M., 1991.

Soloviev S.M. The history of Rosis from ancient times. UP book. M., 1962.

Anisimov E.V. Peter the Great: the birth of an empire // History of the Fatherland. People, ideas, solutions. M., 1991.

Pilnyak B. His Majesty Knes Rieg Kotapaog. Pg., 1922.

Burovsky A.M. Russia, which was not-2. Russian Atlanti yes. M., 2000. |

Bogoslovsky M.M. Zemstvo self-government in the Russian North in the 17th century. T. 1-2. M., 1909-1912.

Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Issue. 3. T. 29. M., 1978. Article "Black-eared peasants".

Pushkarev S.G. Review of Russian history. SPb., 1999.

Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 2. Rostov-on-Don, 2000.

Rabinovich M.I. the fate of things. M., 1974.

Solovyov L.V. The Tale of Khoja Nasreddin. L., 1980. Peresvetov R.T. Secrets of faded lines. M., 1961. Bushkov A.A. Russia, which was not. M., 1997.

Budyko M.I. Mysteries of history. Historical and literary essays. SPb., 1995.

Alaev L.B. This is how I saw India. M., 1971.

Lysov F. Portrait of Alexander Nevsky // Portrait in Russian and Western European Art. Chelyabinsk, 1995.



345

Lebec S. Origin of the Franks. U-IX centuries. A New History of Medieval France. M., 1993.

Soloviev S.M. History of Russia since ancient times. Book W. M., 1961.

Soloviev S.M. History of Russia since ancient times. Book \1. M., 1961.

Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Issue. 3. T. 21. M., 1975. Article "Protectionism".

Klyuchevsky V.O. Works in nine volumes. T. 11. M .., 1988. Bussov K. Moscow Chronicle: 1564-1613. M.-L., 1961.

Possevino A. Historical writings about Russia XY! V. M., 1983.

Gogol N.V. Night before Christmas // Gogol N.V. Evenings on a farm near Dikanny. Mirgorod. Tales. M., 1970.

Uspensky B.A. The Dualistic Character of Russian Medieval Culture// Uspensky B.A. Selected works. T. |. M., 1996.

Herberstein S. Notes on Muscovy. M., 1988.

Gogol N.V. Terrible revenge // Gogol N.V. Evenings on a Farm Near Dikanka. Mirgorod. Tales. M., 1970.

Beskrovny L.G. Reader on Russian military history. M., 1947.

Dybkovskaya A., Zharyn M., Zharyn Ya. History of Poland from ancient times to the present day. Warsaw, 1995.

Clothing of the peoples of Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages. M., 1989.

Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Issue. 3. T. 7. M., 1972. Article "Gordon".

Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Issue. 3. T. 17. M., 1974. Article "Nizhny Novgorod Fair".

Ludolf V. Russian Grammar. L., 1937.

Shakhmatov A.A. Introduction to the course of the history of the Russian language. Part 1. Pg., 1916.

Darrell J. The Land of Rustles. M., 1964.

Ivanov V. Tale of ancient years. L., 1985.

Ovchinikov V. Sanury branch. M., 1972.

Bible. M., 1997.

History of Russia from ancient times to the end of the 17th century / Ed. P.V. Volobuev. M., 2000.

346

Beskrovny L.G. Russian army and navy at the end of the 17th-17th centuries. M., 1968.

Essays on the history of the USSR. XU \ UP century / Ed. N.M. Druzhinin. M., 1955.

Shirokorad A. Encyclopedia of domestic artillery. Minsk, 2000.

Smirnov N.A. Russia and Türkiye in the XU!-XVII centuries. M., 1946.

Orwell J. Suppression of Literature // Orwell J. "1984" and essays of various years. M., 1989.

Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 2. Rostov-on-Don, 2000.

Massey R. Peter the Great. T. 1-3. Smolensk, 1996.

Soloviev S.M. History of Russia since ancient times. USh book. M., 1962.

Klein L.S. Another love. M., 2000.

Wander P., Shader R. Attention deficit disorder with hyperactivity // Psychiatry / Ed. R. M. Sheider. 1998.

Shlesinger A.M. cycles of American history. M., 1992. Essays on the history of the USSR. XIU-XV centuries. M., 1953.

Tarle E. V. The Northern War and the Swedish invasion of Russia. M., 1958.

War with Turkey in 1711 Prut operation // Sat. documents ed. Myshlaevsky A.Z. SPb., 1898.

Illeritsky V. Expedition of Prince Cherkassky to Khiva (1716-1717) // History magazine. 1940. No. 7.

Bykhovsky I.A. Petrovsky shipbuilders. L., 1982.

Yurganov A.L., Katsva L.A. History of Russia M., 1996.

Milyukov P.N. Essays on Russian culture. T. 2. M., 1994. Semevsky M.I. The Secret Service of Peter I. Minsk, 1993. Pososhkov I.T. A book about poverty and wealth. M., 1951.

Uspensky B.A., Lotman Yu.M. The role of dual representations in the dynamics of Russian culture // Selected Works. T. 1. M., 1996.

Alekseev S.P. The unimaginable happens. M., 1980.  
Pylyayev M.I. Old Petersburg. SPb., 1889. Platonov S.F. Lectures on Russian history. M., 1993.

347

Soloviev S.M. History of Russia since ancient times. Book [H. M., 1963.

Eger O. World history in 4 volumes. Volume 3. St. Petersburg, 1894.  
Mavrodin V.V. The birth of a new Russia. L., 1988.

Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Issue. 3. T. 1. M., 1970. Article "Alexey Petrovich".

Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Issue. 3.T. 9. M., 1972. Article "Catherine I".

Klyuchevsky V.O. Russian history. Full course of lectures. T. 3. Rostov-on-Don, 2000.

Pavlenko N.I. Semi-ruler. M., 1991.

Kostomarov N.M. Russian history in the biographies of its main figures. M., 1992.

Dubov N.I. Wheel of Fortune. M., 1981. Falk-Rönne A. Where are you, paradise? M., 1989. Glinsky B.B. Royal children and their mentors. SPb.-M., 1912.

Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Issue. 2.T. 50. Article "USSR. Historical essay. M., 1957.

Nechkina M.V., Leibengrub P.S. History of the USSR. Textbook for grade 7. Fifteenth edition. M., 1980.

The history of homeland. Textbook for the 8th grade of high school / Ed. B.A. Rybakova, A.A. Preobrazhensky. 5th edition. M., 1993.

The life and adventures of A. Bolotov, described by him for his descendants. M.-L., 1931.

Lotman Yu.M. Conversations about Russian culture. SPb., 1994. Pomerants G.S. Paradoxes of modernization // Man. 1990. No. 1.

Pushkin A.S. History of Pugachev // Pushkin A.S. Complete collected works in ten volumes. T. 8. M.-L., 1949.

## CONTENT

Introduction: zoo ree 5

Part 1. PRINCE OF THE SECOND FRESHNESS

Chapter 1

Chapter Z3. What did Peter reform? ..... 93 Chapter 4. Changes in the structure of society .... 131

Part II. THE GENERATION OF THE ANTICHRIST

Chapter 1. The Antichrist on the Throne ..... 171 Chapter 2.  
The Afterlife of Peter ..... 181 Chapter 3. About a regular  
state ..... 198 Chapter 4. Two words about "protection from a  
fool" . 218 Chapter 5. Companions of the Antichrist ..... 232 Chapter  
6. Exception to the rule ..... 246

### Part III. CONSEQUENCES OF GOVERNING

#### ANTICHRIST

Chapter 1. Son of Antichrist -...-...-... 269 Chapter 2. Wives  
of Antichrist ..... 298 Chapter 3. Victims of  
Antichrist ..... 312 Chapter 4. From side to side ..... 321  
Chapter 5. Historical virtuality. ... 334 Conclusion, or Portraits  
on the Wall .... 342

List of used literature ..... 345

Andrey Burovsky  
PETER THE FIRST - THE DAMNED EMPEROR

Published in the author's edition

Art editor /1. Volkov Technical editor V. Kulagina  
Computer proofing I. Kondratyuk Proofreader  
N. Vitko

Yauza Publishing House LLC  
109507, Moscow, Samarkand boulevard, 15

For correspondence: 127299, Moscow, st. Clara Zetkin, 18/5. Tel.: (495) 745-58-23

OOO Publishing House Eksmo  
127299, Moscow, st. Clara Zetkin, 18/5. Tel. 411-68-86, 956-39-21. Note glade: mlim.ekato.gi E-tai:  
m'o@ekato.gi

Signed for publication on 28.01.2008.  
Format 84x108 a "Koppp" typeface. Offset printing. Paper type. Conv. oven  
I. 18.48. Circulation 5000 copies. Zach. M8  
7307.

Printed with CP technology  
JSC "Printing Yard" A. M. Gorky. 197110, St. Petersburg,  
Chkalovsky pr., 15.

Wholesale of Eksmo books: Eksmo Trading  
House LLC. 142700, Moscow region, Leninsky district, Vidnoye, Belokamennoye sh., 1, multi-  
channel phone. 411-50-74. E-tai: geserNop@ekKzto-za! e.-gi

For the purchase of Eksmo books by foreign  
wholesale buyers, please contact Deep Pocket LLC.

nopa! \$ale\$:  
Shetavopa! ipo@ezae sizeeg\$ poi sotas| "Oeer Roske1 RM. Tsa. Gog those oh \$. TogeyutzeNeg@eokzto-  
zale.-gi

For ordering books for corporate clients, including in a special  
design, please contact Forum LLC: tel. 411-73-58  
ext. 2598. E-tpay: mrhakah@ek@to.gi

Wholesale of paper and white and stationery  
for the school and office "Kants-Eksmo": Company "Kants-Eksmo": 142702,  
Moscow region, Leninsky district, Vidnoe-2, Belokamennoye sh., 1, PO box 5. Tel./fax +7 (495) 745-28-87  
(multichannel). e-tai: kCaps@exto-zale.gi, website: mlimi.Caps-ekZto.gi

Full range of books published by Eksmo publishing house for wholesale buyers: In St. Petersburg:  
OOO SZKO, Obukhovskoy Oborony Avenue, 84E. Tel. (812) 365-46-03/04. In Nizhny  
Novgorod: OOO Trade House  
Eksmo NN, st. Marshal Voronov, 3. Tel. (8312) 72-36-70. In Kazan: LLC "NKP Kazan", st.  
Frejernaya, d. 5. Tel. (843)  
570-40-45/46. In Rostov-on-Don: RDC-Rostov LLC, Stachki Ave., 243A. Tel. (863) 268-83-59/60. In  
Samara: RDC-Samara LLC, 75/1 Kirov Ave., letter "E". Tel. (846) 269-66-70.  
In Yekaterinburg: RDC-Ekaterinburg  
LLC, st. Pribaltiyskaya, 24a. Tel. (343) 378-49-45. In Kyiv: LLC DC "Eksmo-Ukraine",  
st. Lugovaya, 9. Tel./fax:  
(044) 501-91-19. In Lviv: TP LLC DC "Eksmo-Ukraine", st. Buzkova, d. 2. Tel./fax (032)  
245-00-19. In Simferopol:  
LLC "Eksmo-Crimea" st. Kyiv, 153 Tel./fax (0652) 22-90-03, 54-32-99.  
Small-scale wholesale trade in books  
"Eksmo" and stationery "Kants-Eksmo":

117192, Moscow, Michurinsky pr-t, 12/1. Tel./Fax: (495) 411-50-76. 127254, Moscow, st.  
Dobrolyubova, d. 2. Tel.: (495) 780-58-34. The full range of products of the Eksmo  
publishing house:

In Moscow, in the chain of stores "New Book": Central Store  
- Moscow, Sukharevskaya Square, 12. Tel. 937-85-81. Volgogradsky prospect, 78, tel.  
177-22-11; st. Bratislavskaya, 12, tel. 346-99-

95.

Information about the shops "New book" by tel. 780-58-81.

In St. Petersburg, in the Bukvoed chain of stores: Shop on Nevsky, 13. Tel. (812) 310-22-44.

For advertising in the books of the Eksmo publishing house, please contact the advertising department. Tel. 411-68-74.

PETER THE FIRST

We are taught from school that Peter the Great is the greatest figure in our history. They say that before him, Russia was lagging behind and wild, and Peter, not having time to ascend the throne, carried out grandiose reforms, created a mighty Empire and an invincible army, established new morals in society, worked on enlightenment, etc. and so on ... and in general, what would we all do without him!

But it is worth digressing from school textbooks and analyzing authentic historical sources. - and we will find that in the pre-Petrine Russia of the XNUMXth century there was already everything that is attributed to Peter: from potatoes and tobacco to an excellent fleet and an army that was quite modern for that time.

In fact, Peter did not create, but destroyed the Russian fleet. Peter's reforms led to the collapse of the economy, incredible chaos in management and the death of millions of people. And on the site of rich and democratic Muscovy, a poor, primitive slave-owning state arose.

The myth of Peter the Great and his "European reforms" still lives in books and souls. It is high time to destroy this dangerous lie that prevents us from knowing and respecting our ancestors.

5VM 978-5-699-26219-9

199

9178569911262

>